PART TWO

GAMES WITH 78 CARDS

CHAPTER EIGHT

General Features of the Game

We have now to describe the very varied and numerous forms of game that have developed from the original Italian game of *trionfi* since its beginnings in the fifteenth century, many of them still played in different parts of Europe, some long obsolete. It would be agreeable if we could simply take them in historical sequence, tracing their evolution over the course of the centuries. Unfortunately, this is difficult to do, because of the gaps in our knowledge. The earliest explicit description of any form of Tarot game is from a French card-game book of 1659, which describes several French versions and one Swiss one. Despite some lacunae which have to be filled by guesses, we can trace the evolution of the game in France, Germany, the Habsburg dominions and elsewhere, from the eighteenth century onwards, from numerous descriptions in German, French and other languages; its history in the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland is uniform with that in France itself, but, in the rest of Switzerland, it appears to have changed very little from the seventeenth century to the present day. Assuming the game to have been introduced into France and Switzerland in about 1500, and into Germany in about 1600, we are, indeed, left, in both cases, with about a century and a half of unrecorded history; but it seems likely that there had been comparatively little evolution before the earliest descriptions in French and German were written.

In order to provide a strictly chronological account, however, we should have to start with Italy, where the game began. There we find, not one continuous tradition of play, but four distinct ones, corresponding to four main centres where the game had taken root before the close of the fifteenth century – Ferrara, Milan, Bologna and Florence. The type of game played in Bologna has always been peculiar to that city and its immediate neighbourhood, and was formerly known as Tarocchino, from being played with a shortened pack of only 62 cards. This game is still very much alive, and we have descriptions of it going back to the eighteenth century, one of which gives information about the mode of play in the preceding century. It is reasonable to assume that the general characteristics of the game go back to the beginning of Tarot play in Bologna in the fifteenth century, although the shortening of the pack probably did not occur until the first half of the sixteenth; but we have no ground to draw inferences from this to the kind of Tarot game played in any other part of Italy. Florence was responsible for another, even more unusual, form of Tarot, Minchiate, played with a specially devised expanded pack of 97 cards. Minchiate, as played at Florence, came to be very popular at Rome as well, and also, in a different form of which we have no record, at Genoa. We have many descriptions of Minchiate, one from the seventeenth century; but, again, we are dealing with a very special form of Tarot game. In Bologna, the shortened 62-card pack entirely superseded the original 78-card form, but in Florence and Rome the 78-card pack survived, alongside the more popular Minchiate pack, until the seventeenth century. We have no direct information about the type of game played in those cities with the 78-card pack, but it is probable that the game still played in Sicily is a descendant of it: though the Sicilian pack was reduced to 63 cards in the course of the eighteenth century, the game had been introduced into Sicily, almost certainly from Rome, in 1663, and was originally played there with a full pack of 78 cards. This represents a tradition of play which may well go back to quite early times in Florence, but probably has little connection with the style of play in more northern parts of Italy.

To the type of game played in Ferrara, and probably also in Venice, we have only a few clues, and cannot reconstruct it with any certainty. But it is Milan that poses our greatest problem. We have eighteenth-century descriptions both of the game of Tarocco, as played with the 78-card pack in Milan and in Lombardy generally, and of the distinct, but broadly similar, games played in Piedmont. The probability is, however, that these games do not represent continuous local traditions of play. From at least the beginning of the eighteenth century, French cardmakers were exporting Tarot packs to Savoy, then an independent state comprising Piedmont as well as Savoy proper, which became part of France only in 1880. Probably the earliest surviving pack of this kind is one made by Jean Dodal of Lyons, who was active there from 1701 to 1715; this pack, of which one example is in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and another in the British Museum, bears, on several cards, the inscription F.P.LE TRENGE, i.e. 'made for export'.[1] The type of design which it exemplifies is a slight variant on the celebrated standard pattern known as the Tarot de Marseille, and is ancestral to the modern Tarocco Piemontese. It differs from the Tarot de Marseille only in a few details; among these are the appearance of a face on the belly of the Devil (trumps XV), a full face rather than a profile on the Moon (trump XVIII), the presence on the Judgment (trump XX) of the droplets that appear on several other cards and the use of the name LE FOL or LE FOU instead of LE MAT for the Fool. By the second quarter of the century this earliest form of the Tarocco Piemontese was being made in Piedmont itself; the earliest example known to me is one by Giuseppe Ottone of Serravalle made in 1736 and now in the Museo de Naipes Fournier in Vitoria.[2] A letter of Thomas Gray testifies to his having seen Tarocco played in Turin in 1739.[3]

All this strongly suggests that the game of Tarot was introduced into Piedmont in the eighteenth century from France via Savoy; and there is no direct evidence of the game's having been played in Piedmont before that date. There is, however, one curious detail of Piedmontese play that suggests that it was: namely that the Angel or Judgment (trump XX) is always treated as superior to the World (trump XXI), an eccentricity that continues to this day. In the Tarot games played, now or formerly, in Bologna, Florence, Rome and Sicily, the Angel, or the card corresponding to it, does indeed rank higher than the World; it is difficult not to suppose that, in this detail of the Piedmontese games, we have a survival from a previous period when the game was played with some quite different type of pack. However this may be, the type of pack used in Piedmont from the eighteenth century down to the present day was certainly of French origin, and this may well be true of the games played there also; we cannot extrapolate with any assurance from the Piedmontese games, as described in the earliest printed sources, to games played in Italy before the eighteenth century.

From the 1740s onward, cardmakers in various parts of Italy began producing Tarot packs with 78 cards whose design constituted another slight variation on the Tarot de Marseille; since, so far as we know, these cards were used only in Lombardy, it may be called the Lombard pattern.[4] The actual designs again differ only slightly from the Tarot de Marseille; the chief divergence in this respect from the Tarocco Piemontese is that the Devil (trump XV) has no face on his belly but wears a pair of furry trousers. The principal difference between the two forms of pack is that those of the Lombard type had the narrow format generally typical of Italian cards, the backs being folded over to form borders for the faces of the cards, whereas the Piedmontese cards are quite wide and do not have the backs folded over. On the testimony of Joseph Baretti, the game of Tarocco was highly popular both in Lombardy and Piedmont by 1768.[5]

---

[1] The British Museum example is F-5 in O'Donoghue's catalogue. The 2 and Cavalier of Cups of the Bibliothèque Nationale copy are illustrated in H.-R. D'Allemagne, *Les Cartes à jouer*, vol. 1, Paris, 1906, p. 192.

[2] No. 25 in the Italian section of the catalogue. A 'Spanish Tarot' was issued by the firm of Fournier a few years ago, based on this pack, but with inscriptions in English at the top of each trump and in Spanish at the bottom of each trump and court card; it cannot be relied on as otherwise a faithful reproduction. An illustration of it is in S.R. Kaplan, *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, New York, 1978, p. 277.

[3] See *The Letters of Thomas Gray chronologically arranged from the Walpole and Mason Collections*, vol. 1, London, 1827, p. 54. Gray, writing from Turin on 16 November 1739, speaks of his having seen taroc played there.

[4] The date 1650 given in the first edition of the catalogue of the Fournier Museum for no. 12 in the Italian section, a pack of Lombard type made in Gorizia, is certainly about 100 years too early. For illustrations of the eighteenth-century Lombard pattern, see C.P. Hargrave, *A History of Playing Cards*, New York, 1930, 1966, pp. 226, 232. For illustrations of nineteenth-century versions, see Roger Tilley, *Playing Cards*, London, 1967, pp. 16-17, and Kaplan, op. cit., pp. 154, 160, 164.

The Lombard variation on the Tarot de Marseille appears to have been of Italian origin, but obviously testifies to strong French influence. We have only a very little information about the design of Tarot cards used in Milan during the two hundred years or so before 1740, and no direct information about the type of Tarot game played there during that period; but it is probable that neither the Tarot de Marseille-derived designs nor the type of game that became popular in Lombardy represented so abrupt a departure from tradition as seems to have occurred in Piedmont. In Lombardy, the World was, and still is, given the rank appropriate to its number (XXI), as superior to the Angel or Judgment (XX); and this accords with what appears to have been the continuous Milanese tradition from the earliest times. Moreover, the Tarot de Marseille designs themselves are likely to have had a fairly close resemblance to those long traditional in Milan. Nevertheless, the probability is that the introduction of the Lombard pattern signalises a historical discontinuity, just as does that of the Tarocco Piemontese. Both the Lombard and Piedmontese patterns share with the Tarot de Marseille two striking features: the particular order and numbering of the trumps; and the inscriptions at the bottom of the trumps and court cards of their names in full (in addition to the numerals at the top of the trumps and at the sides of the numeral cards of the suits). The order which the trump subjects have in the Tarot de Marseille goes back to the mid-sixteenth century in France. Although the order observed in Milan was certainly similar, we have no reason to suppose that the precise order employed in the Tarot de Marseille was ever known in Italy before the eighteenth century. We cannot rule it out as impossible that this impression is due only to our ignorance; but the evidence from the inscriptions appears decisive. Nowhere in Italy was it the regular practice to inscribe their names on the trump cards. We have specific evidence that it was not done in Milanese packs before the eighteenth century; before that time, such names are found in Italian packs only of an obviously non-standard type, such as the Sola-Busca *tarocchi*. In France, however, the practice goes back to the seventeenth century, and, so far as we know, was always observed in the Tarot de Marseille. What appears to clinch the case is that, in the earliest versions both of the Tarocco Piemontese and of the Lombard pattern, the inscriptions were *in French*. Moreover, these French inscriptions employ precisely those names used for the trump cards in the Tarot de Marseille; particularly noteworthy is the use for the trump XVI of the surprising name *La Maison Dieu*, meaning 'The House of God' or, possibly, 'The Hospital', a name by which it is always known in the Tarot de Marseille, but for which no equivalent term has ever been used in Italian. It was only at a later stage that the inscriptions in both types of Italian Tarot de Marseille-derived pack were rendered into Italian, *La Maison Dieu* then becoming *La Torre* (the Tower). In the same way, the early packs follow the usual Tarot de Marseille custom of omitting the name of Death (trump XIII), inscribed *La Morte* when the inscriptions were later translated into Italian; and, in the early packs, the third court card of each suit is labelled *Cavalier* or *Chevalier*, although in Italian this card has always been known as *Cavallo* (Horse), which name was used when the inscriptions went into Italian.

Now we can, no doubt, imagine a vogue for a French type of design, and, with it, for the French practice of inscribing their names on the trump cards, affecting the designs employed by Italian cardmakers without any other break in continuity. But this leaves the use of inscriptions in the French language unexplained. There was not in Lombardy, as there was in Savoy, a substantial French-speaking population; if it had been a matter merely of the introduction of a new style of design to replace an old one, we should surely expect that, from the start, the inscriptions would have been in Italian, using the names customary among players of the game. The fact

[5] Joseph Baretti, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of Italy*, vol 2, London, 1768, pp. 219-21.

that the cardmakers not only took over, almost intact, the Tarot de Marseille designs, bût at the same time adopted the French inscriptions, strongly suggests that the introduction of the Lombard pattern represented the reintroduction into Lombardy of the Tarot pack itself and of the game played with it, that game having died out there at some earlier date, perhaps by the end of the seventeenth century; this may well have happened in Piedmont also, although there the gap between the demise of the indigenous game and the reintroduction of Tarot games from France must have been short enough for some players to have remembered the traditional ranking of the Angel and the World relative to each other. On this hypothesis, it is entirely plausible that it should have been the Tarot de Marseille designs that were borrowed: by the early eighteenth century, there was probably no form of 78-card pack surviving in mainland Italy. The Bolognese pack had long ago been reduced to 62 cards; in Florence and Rome, the 78-card pack had probably succumbed to competition from the 97-card Minchiate pack; in Ferrara and Venice, all forms of Tarot game seem to have been long defunct.

It follows that we can no more assume that the form of Tarot game we find played in Lombardy in the eighteenth century represented a continuous indigenous tradition than we can make the parallel assumption for Piedmont. As a matter of fact, we shall later see that, if we did make this assumption, our deductions would probably not be seriously in error; but this is a point that needs to be argued for, certainly not to be assumed. The general upshot is this. We can, with fair confidence, reconstruct the history of Bolognese Tarocchi, and can even speculate from what game played with the full 78-card pack the game of Tarocchino might have been derived. We know how Minchiate was played, and may reasonably presume that its main features were present from the start. We can make only vague conjectures about the game played in Florence and Rome with the 78-card pack, conjectures based on the Sicilian game and on Minchiate. All of these, however, are forms of Tarot game which had no influence on the games played with the 78-card pack in other parts of Europe. We have little direct evidence for the type of Tarot game played in Ferrara and Venice, and none for that played in Milan before the eighteenth century; any conclusions we reach about the latter can be based only upon a presumed relationship with games played in other countries. It has therefore seemed better to abandon any attempt at a strictly chronological account. Instead, I shall, in Part II, describe those Tarot games played with the 78-card pack outside Italy, together with those played in Piedmont and Lombardy from the eighteenth century onwards. Part III will be exclusively devoted to Italy; the games of which we have actual accounts, or which are still played, will first be described, after which it will be possible to speculate about those games for which we have no conclusive evidence. Part IV will describe that great family of Tarot games in which the card originally known as the Fool has assumed an exalted rank.

In our survey of all the various forms that the game of Tarot has assumed at different periods and in different countries, we shall encounter certain features again and again; and, to avoid pointless repetition, it is well to adopt a constant terminology for these at the outset.

General terminology for Tarot games

Stages of the game

All card games take place in stages, punctuated by a dealer's distributing the cards to the other players and to himself; and, as stated in the last chapter, we shall use the term *round* to apply to the period of play between one such deal and the next. Card players are more accustomed to use 'hand' or 'deal'; but these can easily lead to ambiguity when an unfamiliar game is being explained. In some games, the players simply play as many rounds as they feel like, adding the score for each to the cumulative total. In others, several rounds in succession may be required before the score can be settled; for instance, the winner or winning side may be stipulated to be the one first reaching, in several rounds, a certain fixed cumulative total. In Italian, such a set of several rounds is usually called a *partita*, in French a *partie*: in this book, it will be called a *game*, following the usual English nomenclature. At the beginning of each round, the deal may be said, in a different sense, to consist of several rounds, one for each time that the dealer comes back to the starting-place; but this should cause no confusion.

Ranking of the cards

As already explained, Tarot games are trick-taking games; any reader who does not clearly understand what this means is referred to the explanation in

Chapter 7. The trick is always won by the highest trump played to it, or, if no trump is played, by the highest card of the suit led. The trumps usually rank in sequence from the XXI (high) down to the I or Bagatto (low): any exceptions to this will be explicitly stated. The top four cards of each suit are invariably King, Queen, Cavalier and Jack (or Maid), in that order. When the numeral cards rank, in Swords and Batons, from 10 (high), 9 and so on down to Ace (low), but, in Cups and Coins, from Ace (high), 2 and so on down to 10 (low), it will be said simply that the suit cards rank *'in their original order'*. Sometimes, however, this practice is abandoned, and the numeral cards rank in every suit, after the court cards, in the order 10 (high) down to Ace (low); in such a case, it will be said that the suit cards rank '*in the simplified order*'. Play is usually counter-clockwise, but sometimes clockwise; it will be taken for granted that the dealer deals in the same cyclic order as that in which play proceeds, and that the deal passes, from one round to the next, in the same direction. A player with the lead is free to lead any card, and the subsequent players to any trick must follow suit if they can, including playing a trump if a trump is led, and, if they cannot follow in a plain suit, must play a trump if they have one regardless of any other considerations. Apart from these constraints, a player is usually free to play any card that he likes; the exceptions will of course be noted. All this will be expressed by saying that *'the usual constraints'* are observed in play.

In almost all Tarot games played with the 78-card pack, the Fool is treated in the manner already explained. It has no trick-taking power, and may be played at any time, irrespective of any obligation to follow suit or to play a trump. It cannot, however, be captured, save in exceptional cases, and is therefore taken back from the centre of the table, and placed with the other cards won in tricks by that player or side; very often, it is not the custom to play it to the centre of the table, but simply to show it to the other players before placing it with the cards won in tricks. More often than not, another card must be given in exchange for the Fool, from among those won in tricks, either immediately or at the end of the round; but since this is not an invariable rule, it will be expressly noted. Whenever the Fool is treated in this general manner, this will be conveyed by saying that *'the Fool serves as Excuse'*: in French Tarot, the card is actually called *l'Excuse*, because it excuses the one who plays it from following suit or trumping, and this provides us with a convenient term for indicating this special role of the card in play. Unless otherwise stated, the Fool may be led to a trick, and the next player may then play any card, which is treated just as if it were the lead, other players having to follow suit to it if they can, or, if they cannot, to trump if they can. Usually, if the player or side which had the Fool makes no tricks at all, the Fool must be surrendered at the end of the round to the player who won the trick to which it was played.

Point-values

As we have seen, the object of the game is almost always to make as many points as possible on the cards won in tricks, different cards having different point-values. The cards are divided into those having no special point-value, which will be called '*low cards*' (a term which will always refer to their *point-values*, not to their trick-taking power), and ones having a high point-value, which will be called '*counting cards*'. In a great many games, the only counting cards are the XXI and the I or Bagatto, that is, the highest and the lowest trumps, the Fool, and the court cards of the four suits; all the numeral cards, and the trump cards from II to XX, are then low cards. In some games, however, there are other counting cards. In games in which the counting cards are the nineteen enumerated above, the most usual point-values are as follows:

The XXI	5 points
The trump I	5 points
The Fool	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Cavalier	3 points
Each Jack	2 points

In certain games, however, even when there are no other counting cards, the point-values differ from these standard ones. When there are only these nineteen counting cards, and they have the values just stated, this will be expressed by saying that '*the counting cards have their standard values*'.

What needs considerable explanation is the method, common to most, though not to all, Tarot games, of reckoning the total point-value of the cards won in tricks by a player or side. This is apt to strike someone who first encounters it as eccentric and puzzling; but the rationale of it is soon understood. The cards are counted out in sets, which may be sets of two, of three, of four or even of some larger number, according to the particular game being played. Let us suppose first that they are counted out in pairs. Then, normally, the pairs will be so arranged that each counting card is accompanied by a low card: the value of such a pair is precisely the number of points given as the point-value of the counting card. For instance, when the point-values are as above, a pair consisting of a Queen and a low card will together be worth 4 points, the point-value of a Queen being 4. Each pair of low cards will be worth 1 point. If, however, the cards cannot be arranged so as to pair off a low card with every counting card, there will be some pairs consisting of two counting cards: the value of such a pair is 1 less than the sum of the point-values of the two counting cards. For instance, with the above point-values, the value of a pair consisting of a King and a Cavalier will be 7 points, one less than the sum of the values of the King (5) and of the Cavalier (3). It must be stressed that it will make no difference to the total of points on a player's cards how he groups them. Suppose a player has won in tricks just six cards, the XXI, a Queen, a Jack and three low cards. If he groups each counting card with a low card, he will have one pair worth 5 points (for the XXI), one worth 4 points (for the Queen) and one worth 2 points (for the Jack): his total will be 5 + 4 + 2 = 11 points. Suppose that instead he takes the XXI with the Queen. That pair will then be worth 5 + 4 − 1 = 8 points. He will also have a pair consisting of the Jack and a low card, worth 2 points, and another comprising two low cards, worth 1 point, making a total of 8 + 2 + 1 = 11 points, the same as before.

When the cards are counted in threes instead of in pairs, a set consisting of a counting card and two low cards will be worth the point-value of the counting card; e.g. a Cavalier and two low cards will together count 3 points. A set consisting of three low cards will count 1 point. A set consisting of two counting cards and a low card will be worth one less than the sum of the point-values of the two counting cards; e.g. the Fool, a Jack and a low card will, on the above values, be worth 5 + 2 − 1 = 6 points. A set consisting of three counting cards will be worth *two* less than the sum of the point-values of the three cards: e.g. the trump I, a King and a Cavalier will be worth 5 + 5 + 3 − 2 = 11 points on the above values. Again, it does not in the least matter to the total score how the cards are grouped. If, instead of saying that the low cards have no value, we say that each has a point-value of 1, then it will be a general rule that each set of three cards has a combined value 2 less than the sum of the point-values of the three cards; it is then obvious that it will make no difference how the cards are distributed among the sets of three.

The same goes if the cards are counted in fours. A set of four consisting of one counting card and three low cards will be worth the point-value of the counting card. A set consisting of four low cards will be worth 1 point. A set consisting of two counting cards and two low cards will have a total value one less than the sum of the point-values of the counting cards. One consisting of three counting cards and one low card will be worth two less than the sum of the values of the counting cards. And a set of four counting cards will be worth *three* less than the sum of their point-values. Once again, if we were to regard each low card as having a point-value of 1, we could say generally that each set of four had a combined value of 3 less than the sum of the values of the individual cards.

This method of reckoning the points won in any round by each player or side is so extremely common, and so perplexing at first sight, that I have thought it right to labour it here, so that it will be quite clear before particular games are described. Having thus explained it generally, I will, in particular cases, say merely that the cards are *counted in pairs, in threes* or *in fours*, and leave it to be understood that the method just described is intended. The only question that remains to be settled is what to do with any odd cards left over: with a single card when the cards are counted in pairs, with one or two cards when they are counted in threes, or with one, two or three cards when they are counted in fours. In some games this cannot happen, in others it can; and, when it can, there are different ways of dealing with it, which will be explained for each game. The matter is simplest when the cards are counted in threes. In this case, the usual practice is that two odd cards that remain over after the cards have been counted out in threes count as if there were three of them: if they are both low cards, they count 1 point, if they include one counting card, they count the value of that counting card, and, if they are both counting cards, they count one less than the sum of their values. A single odd card that remains over then counts nothing if it is a low card, and one point less than its value if it is a counting card. A player will never have so many counting cards that he cannot so arrange his cards that the odd ones remaining over are all low cards. Hence, when the method just described is adopted, this may be succinctly indicated by saying that *'two odd low cards count 1 point and one odd low card counts nothing'*.

Readers who did not skip the last chapter will at once see the rationale of this method of reckoning points, which otherwise may at first be obscure. Suppose we have a three-handed game, in which the cards are counted out in threes; there will then be no cards left over when a player counts his cards, because there must be three cards in every trick. Now it is plain that an apparently quite different method of reckoning the total number of points from that described above would yield the same result. Suppose that, instead of counting out the cards in threes in the above manner, a player were to reduce the point-value of every counting card by one, and simply reckon up the total of these reduced point-values, adding 1 for every set of three cards: a moment's reflection will show that he will arrive at the same total as by the other method. Since, in a three-handed game, each trick consists of three cards, adding one point for every set of three is tantamount to adding one for every trick taken. And, indeed, in very exceptional cases, we find the rule for reckoning points given in precisely this way: the point-value of each counting card is cited as being one lower than those usually given, and there is stated to be an additional point for each trick won. Just this is the method of reckoning points employed in the Spanish game of Malilla and its more famous French offspring Manille: and there can be no doubt that it was the original rule in Tarot.

Presumably the nearly universal method that was described above arose simply as a matter of convenience. Players found it tedious to carry out two operations, one of counting the number of tricks and one of adding up the point-values of the counting cards, and fused the two together by adopting the foregoing procedure. At first, the combined operation would be thought of as consisting of adding 1 to the sum of the point-values of the counting cards in each trick. But, in the course of time, since there would most often be at most one counting card in a trick, and since it might, in any case, be easiest to count by rearranging the cards so that no more than one counting card was included in a trick, the point-values associated with the counting cards must have come to be increased by one; and thus the method of reckoning that has been described would have been arrived at.

It is, however, evident that, very often, the original rationale of the procedure was forgotten. Let us say that, when the cards are counted out in pairs, 2 is the 'base number' in that game, and, when they are counted out in threes or in fours, that 3 or 4 is the 'base number'. Then the original rationale of the method requires the base number always to be the same as the number of players, and thus as the number of cards in each trick. But, as we shall see, this is not always the case: there are three- or four-handed games in which the base number is 2, and four-handed games in which it is 3. In all such cases, the probable explanation is that, at some former time, the most popular form of the game was one in which there were that number of players given by the base number: that the practice of counting the cards out in threes is testimony to the former predominance of a three-handed game, and that of counting them out in pairs to the popularity of a two-handed form. The rationale of the method of reckoning points being forgotten, the practice of counting the cards out in pairs or in threes (of using 2 or 3 as the base number) was then thoughtlessly transferred to games with a different number of players. It is obvious that, the lower the base number, the greater becomes the comparative importance of winning low cards in tricks: of course it is always of importance to win counting cards.

Any beginner at Tarot must accustom himself to counting out his cards in this manner. At first, the adding and subtracting seem to involve a great effort; but, as with everything of the sort, it quickly becomes second nature.

Card points and game points

A frequent source of confusion in descriptions of card games is the use in different senses of the word 'points'. Very few card games are, like chess, simply won, lost or drawn: in virtually all the score is reckoned in points, and, when the play is for money, settled at so much per point, per hundred points, or the like. In some games, such as simple trick-taking games like Bridge, the points in which the score is kept are the only ones involved, since the outcome of each round depends upon the number of *tricks* made by each side. But, in complex trick-taking games like Tarot, it is often important to maintain a sharp distinction between the points won on cards taken in tricks in any one round and the score for that round. In the simplest cases, indeed, there may be no such distinction: at the end of each round, a player may simply write down as his score the number of points that he won on the cards that he captured in play. It is reasonable to suppose that this was the original system. But, very often, it is not like this. Very often, the points won on the cards taken in tricks serve simply to determine which player or side has won the round: the points then allocated to each player as his score are then computed according to some different system. To avoid ambiguity, I shall, as stated in Chapter 7, use the expression '*game points*' to mean those that are written down on the score card and used at the end of play to determine the final money settlement between the players, or that are translated immediately into cash terms at the end of each round. The unqualified term '*points*', on the other hand, will be used exclusively for those by reference to which it is determined, at the end of each round, which players have won and which have lost, for instance the points on the cards won in tricks. It would be possible to be even more explicit, and use the term 'card points' for these, as we did in Chapter 7. But this would not only be cumbersome, but also, in some cases, inaccurate; for, in some games, the points that go to determine win or loss of a round will include others besides those won on individual cards, for instance a bonus for winning the last trick or for having had some special combination of cards in one's hand at the start of play. The term '*card points*' will, however, sometimes be used in this sense, when it is necessary to emphasise the distinction from game points, and no inaccuracy is involved. Very occasionally, there is also an intermediate stage between the card points and the game points: some system of reckoning that is one level above the points won in each round, but does not yet represent the final score on which the settlement is based. In such a case, I will avoid confusion by not using the word 'points' at all for this intermediate level, but employ some other suitable term.

With these preliminaries, we are now ready to embark on our study of the various different games that have been and are played with the Tarot pack.

CHAPTER NINE

The Early Stages of the Game in France

The game of Tarot was played in France from the beginning of the sixteenth century. The earliest certain reference to it, as the game of *tarau*, was that made by Rabelais in 1534.[1] We noted in Chapter 4 that Duke René II of Lorraine played *triumphe* in 1496 and that there is a reference to the game of *triumphe* as early as 1482;[2] but we saw the difficulty of deciding whether these references are to the game of Tarot or to one played with the regular pack. Even if the former, we can say, what is not surprising, that the game was not yet known in France in 1465, since the statutes, drawn up in that year, of the earliest association of master cardmakers in the whole of France, that of Toulouse, speak of *naips sive cartas* but make no mention of *triumphi*.[3] Whether or not the game of Tarot was played in France in 1482 or in Lorraine in 1496, we shall see in Chapter 20 that Tarot is likely to have enjoyed its first real wave of popularity in France after 1500. In any case, the game has been continuously played in France from its first introduction down to the present day. There are several references both to the game and the cards from sixteenth-century France, some of which were mentioned in Chapter 5. It is referred to, as being played with Italian cards, in the *Paradoxes* of Charles Étienne of Paris in 1553, and by Pierre de Larivey Champenois in 1576.[4] The game is recorded as having been played by some noblemen in the city of Grenoble in 1579;[5] and it was also referred to by Claude Gauchet in a poem published in 1583, and by Delamothe in his book of 1592 for teaching French to English speakers.[6] In the last two decades of the century, playing cards and dice began to be taxed, and at quite a heavy rate; this prompted protests from the cardmakers, and sometimes from the provincial *parlements*. These tax laws invariably distinguish between (regular) cards and tarots, imposing a higher rate on the latter; they thereby testify to the production of Tarot packs in late sixteenth-century France on a scale large enough to impinge on the consciousness of the royal authorities and to merit the imposition of a distinct scale of taxation. The first such law was made by Henri III in 1581, and applied only to cards made for export; this was followed by the edict of 1583, quoted in Chapter 5, which imposed a tax on all playing cards, 1 sou for a regular pack and 2 sous for a Tarot pack. At the time, Rouen and Lyons were rivals as the greatest centres for the production of playing cards in France. In response to a remonstrance by the États de Normandie in 1585, the tax was specially reduced for playing cards made in Rouen to 10 deniers for a regular pack and 20 deniers for a Tarot pack; cards made for export to Spain, Flanders and England were to be taxed at 8 deniers a pack, those made for Portugal at 6 deniers and those made for Switzerland at 3 deniers. For our purposes, the important fact is that Tarot cards were being made in Rouen by 1585. The Parlement of Normandy was still not satisfied with this, and in 1586 petitioned again for the complete abolition of the tax; they appear to have been successful.[7] In Lyons much the same took place: the Parlement refused to register the law of 1583, and, after a protest by the cardmakers saying that many of their number had left for Savoy, Spain, Switzerland or Lorraine, the law was in 1586 suspended for Lyons.[8]

---

[1] *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, book I, ch. 22; see also ch. 23 of Book V, published 11 years after the death of Rabelais in 1553, and probably not by him.

[2] H.-R. D'Allemagne, *Les Cartes à jouer*, Paris, 1906, vol. II, p. 212, and F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, vol. X, Complément, Paris, 1902, s.v. 'triomphe', or Du Cange (sieur Charles du Fresne), *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, vol. VI, Paris, 1845, s.v. 'triumphus'. Du Cange cites the word as written *triumple*, surely a misreading. Godefroy's reference is Archives Nationales, series JJ, register 206, folio 181 recto; Du Cange's is Lit. remiss, ann. 1482 ex Reg. 206 Chartoph. reg. ch. 828. The phrase reads '*Lesquelz se esbatirent à jouer aux quartes au jeu du triumphe*' (who amused themselves by playing the card game of *triumphe*). Series JJ of the Archives Nationales consists of *lettres de rémission*, i.e. royal pardons for breaches of the law. Without a visit to the Archives, which I have not made, there is no way of telling to which part of France it relates, but it must have been to somewhere within the Kingdom as it then was.

[3] *Statuta nayperiorum*, written in Latin and Provençal, printed in D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 528-35; see pp. 530, 534.

[4] Charles Étienne, *Paradoxes*, Paris, 1553, p. 49, and Champenois, *Les Facétieuses nuits*, Paris, 1576. Night XIII, Tale 7.

[5] E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Le Carnaval de Romans*, Paris, 1979, p. 91.

[6] Claude Gauchet, *Le Plaisir des champs*, Paris, 1583, p. 252 (second edition, Paris, 1604, p. 248; re-edition, ed. P. Blanchemain, Paris, 1869, p. 288), and G. Delamothe, *The French Alphabeth*, London, 1592, pp. 150-1. Gauchet describes a company of people in wintertime passing the day indoors playing games, of which he mentions three: *flux* (flush, a card game), draughts and Tarot ('... *nostre trouppe serrée, N'abandonnant le feu, jusques à la soirée, Passe le jour au flux, quelquefois au damier; Les autres le tarot ayment à manier*'). This reference should be added to those of Chapter 5, p. 100.

Thus by the end of the sixteenth century, and probably long before that, Tarot packs were being produced in both Lyons and Rouen. They were also produced in Paris; in their statutes of 1594, the master cardmakers of Paris repeatedly referred to their profession as that of *cartiers et faiseurs de cartes, tarotz, feuilletz et cartons* (cardmakers and makers of cards, tarots, leaflets and cardboard).[9] Right at the end of the century, in 1599, they began to be produced in Nancy; Lorraine had hitherto imported playing cards from Lyons, but in that year Duke Charles III ordered the establishment of workshops in Nancy to produce *cartes, taraulx et dês* (cards, tarots and dice).[10] Yet, from the entire century, only one Tarot pack, made in France, survives to us out of the thousands that must have been made: this is the pack, already mentioned, made by Catelin Geoffroy of Lyons in 1557.[11] A Catelin Geoffroy is recorded as having worked as a cardmaker in Lyons between 1582 and 1603;[12] and the letter of Duke Charles III of Lorraine authorising the establishment of cardmaking businesses in Nancy exhorted the cardmakers to produce cards and tarots 'as good and fine as those made at Lyons under the name of Cathelin Geoffroy.'[13] This later Catelin Geoffroy was presumably the son of the one whose cards have survived. The pack, of which thirty-eight cards remain, is certainly a beautiful one; it is from a historical standpoint unfortunate that it appears to be completely non-standard. Even the suit-signs are eccentric, comprising Parrots, Peacocks and Lions; the fourth suit was presumably of Monkeys, since the suit cards are copies of those of a regular pack of 1544, in which just those four suit-signs were used, made by Virgil Solis (1514-1562) of Nuremberg. Twelve trumps survive. All the cards have borders with diagonal shading and an index in the centre at the top and, reversed, at the bottom. The trumps bear Roman numerals, the numeral cards of the suits bear Arabic numerals, and the court cards bear initial letters for both rank and suit, P standing both for *Perroquets* (Parrots) and *Paons* (Peacocks). The trump subjects are standard ones, and, so far as can be told, are arranged in precisely the order later found in the Tarot de Marseille; they consist of the Bateleur (I), Popess (II), Empress (III), Emperor (IIII), Pope (V), Chariot (VII), Hermit (IX), Hanged Man (XII), Death (XIII), Temperance (XIIII), the Lightning (XVI) and the Judgment (XX). These trump cards do not bear inscriptions giving their names. With one exception, the designs of the trump cards have, so far as we know, no correspondence in detail with those of any standard pattern, and it seems likely that the pack was intended as a non-standard, luxury item. The one exception is the Hanged Man; though it in no way resembles the usual Tarot de Marseille design, the figure being shown in profile rather than full face, it reappears in occasional Tarot de Marseille packs made in Switzerland, such as one of *c.* 1755 made by Claude Burdel of Fribourg and one of *c.* 1865 by Gassmann of Geneva.[14] Trump XVI, here designated the Lightning, corresponds to the Tower or *Maison Dieu* of the Tarot de Marseille; somewhat as in the Minchiate pack, it shows a woman, who is playing a viol, being grabbed by a devil; in the background are another figure, an archway and a window with smoke pouring from it. For the rest, the designs of the trump cards are iconographically straightforward; on trump I, the Bateleur is seated with his wares upon a table, round which three figures are standing, and the Hermit (trump IX) is a friar, wearing a rosary and carrying a lantern. The Ace of Parrots bears the inscription 'Catelin Geoffroy 1557', and some other cards bear the initials C.G.

---

[7] For the tax laws in general, and in particular in Rouen, see H.-R. D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 293-4, and vol. II, p. 118, and M.L. Chanoine-Davranches, *Histoire du jeu de cartes en Normandie*, Rouen, 1892, p. 13.

[8] D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. I, p. 294, vol. II, p. 242.

[9] Ibid., vol. II, pp. 60-2.

[10] Ibid., vol. II, pp. 212-13.

[11] The cards are in the Museum für Kunsthandwerk, Frankfurt am Main, catalogue number K1; they measure 125 x 68 mm. Seventeen of them are illustrated in D. Hoffmann, *Die Welt der Spielkarten*, Leipzig, 1972, plates 15b and 36a, nine in colour. Nine are illustrated in S.R. Kaplan, *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, New York, 1978, p. 132.

[12] D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. II, p. 212.

[13] Ibid. The letter says that the cards and tarots 'seront et devront aussy belles et bonnes que celles qui se font à Lion soubz le nom de Cathelin Geoffroy'.

In the seventeenth century, the taxation of playing cards continued; again, *tarots* are always mentioned in the edicts separately from *cartes*. In 1605, the tax was re-established everywhere, including Rouen and Lyons, at the higher rate of 15 deniers for a regular pack and 2 sous, 6 deniers for a Tarot pack (there were 12 deniers to one sou). There was a further edict of 1622, confirming the tax imposed in 1605; and there was frequent legislation governing the collection of the taxes and regulating the manufacture of playing cards, in 1625, 1628, 1629, 1635, 1636, 1640, 1644 and 1661, all mentioning tarots specifically.[15] In Rouen the États protested against the tax of 1605 on cards and tarots in 1605, 1607 and 1608; in 1605 they said that many cardmakers whom the 1583 law had driven to England and Flanders had returned to France after its suspension for Rouen, and in 1608 they complained that the new tax had caused thousands of families to leave their native land to seek a living among *des nations rudes et estrangères* (uncouth foreign nations). In 1609 the tax was rescinded for Rouen, but after the edict of 1622 it was reimposed; the consequent protest of 1623, which specified that many cardmakers had emigrated to England, was this time unsuccessful.[16] In Lyons the Parlement again refused to register the tax decree of 1605, and a protest addressed by the cardmakers of Lyons to the Treasury in 1608 spoke of the making of *cartes et tarotz* as one of the principal industries of the city, supplying not only the kingdom of France but also Italy, Spain and Flanders.[17] As a result, the tax was abolished for Lyons in 1609. Article 9 of the statutes of the master cardmakers of Lyons, adopted in 1614, confirms that they were still engaged in the production of tarots as well as other cards. The reimposition of the tax in 1622 evoked a new protest from the *maistres et ouvriers de cartes et tarotz* of Lyons in 1623, which says that many had left for Switzerland and Besançon in order to escape the new tax, and, in particular, that the Duke of Savoy had lured many cardmakers to Turin and Chambéry. The Lyons cardmakers, more fortunate that their colleagues in Rouen, succeeded in getting the tax annulled for Lyons in 1623.[18] Their statutes were revised in 1650; article 9 continued to refer to *taros*.[19]

Meanwhile, the cardmaking industry of Marseilles was under way. Marseilles was to become another great centre of playing-card manufacture, rivalling Lyons; in the seventeenth century, its cardmakers produced eight distinct kinds of cards, including Tarots, many for export, to Spain, Portugal, Genoa and Lima.[20] In 1608 the Lyons cardmakers petitioned for a prohibition on the manufacture of playing cards in Marseilles, but it was authorised by a royal edict of 1631.[21] Tarot cards were produced elsewhere in France as well. A royal patent of 1663 licensed the production of playing cards and *taraux* in Toulon;[22] royal permission for the production of *cartes, tarotz et dez* (cards, tarots and dice) in Bordeaux was sought in 1665 and granted in 1669.[23] Tarot cards also continued to be made in Paris; the additions of 1613 to the statutes of the master cardmakers of Paris regulated the making both of ordinary cards and of tarots.[24]

---

[14] See Kaplan, op. cit., p. 163 for an illustration of the Gassmann pack, and p. 242 for one of a pack of 1972 by Müller based on the Burdel one.

[15] See D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 294-306.

[16] See Chanoine-Davranches, op. cit., pp. 14-15, and D'Allemagne, vol. II, pp. 118-20.

[17] D'Allemagne, vol. I, p. 296, vol. II, pp. 242, 499.

[18] Ibid., vol. I, pp. 297-8, vol. II, pp. 244, 246, 492, 502.

[19] Ibid., vol. II, p. 258.

[20] Ibid., vol. II, p. 317.

[21] Ibid., vol. II, p. 306; see also the catalogue, *Cinq siècles de cartes à jouer en France*, by Jean-Pierre Seguin, published as fascicule 205 of *Le Vieux Papier*, September 1963.

[22] D'Allemagne, vol. II, pp. 338, 526.

[23] Ibid., vol. II, pp. 412, 414, 538-9.

The Jesuit François Garasse wrote in 1622 that the game of Tarots was more widely played among the French than that of chess.[25] In 1659 there was published, in the edition for that year of *La Maison académique des jeux*, the earliest detailed description of the game of Tarot to appear in print in any country. It is not at all surprising that this should be so, since it was in France and in England that the idea first occurred to anybody to publish a book containing instructions for playing card games. Previously it had been taken for granted that you learned such a game only by being taught by your aquaintances, and, in other countries, we have to wait until the eighteenth or even the nineteenth century before card-game books appear. The 1659 *Maison académique* was only the second in the series; but thereafter books of this kind continued to come out in France in an unbroken succession, with some changes of title, down to modern times, new editions appearing after an interval of usually no more than three or four years. For the most part, the account of each game was simply reprinted from one edition to the next. It was only with highly fashionable games such as Ombre, which underwent a rapid evolution, that the description was frequently rewritten; indeed, that of Ombre and its derivatives expanded so as to fill half the book. The account of *Taros* was reprinted in all editions of the *Maison académique* up to 1702. There was then an unusually long gap in the sequence, and, when it was resumed with the *Académie universelle des jeux* of 1718, Tarot had been dropped. The original seventeenth-century account suddenly reappeared in a volume of 1814, and, very spasmodically, in other nineteenth-century books; but this can have been due only to a piece of antiquarianism on the part of an editor who had read the seventeenth-century books, but was otherwise unacquainted with the game.

A million is probably a highly conservative estimate for the number of Tarot packs produced in France during the seventeenth century; of those, no more than four have survived to us. There are two complete packs, both made in Paris, in the Bibliothèque Nationale;[26] one nearly complete pack made in Rouen belongs to a private collector, Mr David Temperley; and an uncut sheet, showing twelve court cards which may come from a Tarot pack made in Toulouse, is in the Musée Paul Dupuy in that city.[27] The famous French standard pattern for Tarot cards is that known as the Tarot de Marseille; it is so called from the great number of Tarot packs made in accordance with this pattern in Marseilles during the eighteenth century, but there is no ground to assume that it was invented there. The two Parisian packs, and that made in Rouen, belong, however, to a different tradition. One of the packs made in Paris was by Jacques Viévil, a cardmaker of whom there are records from 1643 to 1664.[28] When H.-R. D'Allemagne wrote his great book on French playing cards in 1906, only the Aces, 2s and 3s from this pack appear to have been known. By the time when an exhibition was held in 1963, all the court cards had been found, although the catalogue expressed a cautious doubt whether they belonged to the same pack.[29] Very recently, Mme Lambert, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, working under the direction of Mlle Gardey, curator of the Réserve des Estampes in the library, has succeeded in reconstituting the entire pack of 78 cards; the result is a discovery of the first importance.[30]

---

[24] D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol II, p. 64.

[25] François Garasse, *Recherche des Recherches* (a bitter attack on Étienne Pasquier's *Recherches de la France* of 1596), Paris, 1622, p. 217; see also p. 222.

[26] Both of them are contained in the volume Kh-34.

[27] See the catalogue *La Carte à jouer en Languedoc des origines à 1800*, Musée Paul Dupuy, Toulouse, 1971, section (1), 'Toulouse', no. 8; the catalogue refers to B. Dusan, 'Cartes à jouer anciennes', *Revue archéologique du Midi*, vol. II, 1869, p. 120, which I have not seen.

[28] D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 188-90, 302, 307, 309; illustrations of the Ace and 2 of Coins, the 2 of Cups and the 3 of Swords appear on pp. 185 and 189.

[29] The catalogue is that by J.-P. Seguin mentioned in footnote 21; the Viévil pack is no. 359. A catalogue, *Le Tarot*, of an exhibition of Tarot cards held in 1971 at the Maison de la Culture in Amiens, published in April 1971 as no. 1 of *La Bibliothèque volante*, mistakenly speaks on p. 30 of the Viévil pack as an example of the Tarot de Marseille.

[30] The cards, both of the Viévil pack and of the other seventeenth-century Parisian pack, and, indeed, of many other packs in the Bibliothèque Nationale, are pasted on to heavy folio pages; for only one card in each pack, in both the present packs the Popess, is a window cut in the page so that the back design may be seen. These pages are clasped, not bound, in a volume, and so are detachable; they are removed for exhibitions or to be photographed. There are a great many such pages which, for one or another reason, are not included in any volume, but lie separately in drawers awaiting classification, a task for whose exectution there

The numeral cards of the suits in Viévil's pack for the most part resemble those of the Tarot de Marseille. In particular, the Batons have just the same flat appearance, the ends of them broadening out, but still flattened; the Swords, too, resemble the Tarot de Marseille, those on the 10 being arranged in just the same way, with two straight swords; as in the Tarot de Marseille, no crown appears on the 3 of Swords and no bird on the 2 of Swords. Three cards, in particular, have designs which might naturally be thought highly characteristic of the Tarot de Marseille. The Ace of Cups shows the same elaborate Gothic chalice. The 2 of Cups has the curious feature, always found in the Tarot de Marseille, of a central stem, between the two cups, from which issue two branches ending in dragon's heads. The 2 of Coins has, encircling the coins, the S-shaped scroll always found on this card in the Tarot de Marseille, sometimes inverted, sometimes not, bearing the maker's name, in this case IACQVES VIEVIL A PARIS. The main difference from the Tarot de Marseille, as far as these numeral cards are concerned, is that they do not bear any Roman numerals to indicate their rank. The court cards and the trumps, on the other hand, display a pattern completely different from the Tarot de Marseille. With four exceptions, and with some minor differences of detail, the designs tally exactly with those used in Tarot packs produced in the eighteenth century in what is now Belgium and was then the Austrian Netherlands. This Belgian pattern has hitherto appeared an anomaly, being the only standard pattern known to have been used outside Italy for the Italian-suited Tarot pack quite unrelated, save in the order of the trumps, to the Tarot de Marseille. The reconstitution of the Viévil pack by Mme Lambert, and the purchase of the Rouen one by Mr Temperley, occurred while this book was in proof. In the original version, I had conjectured that the Belgian pattern had in fact derived from some standard French pattern, distinct from the Tarot de Marseille, the traces of which had disappeared; this conjecture was conclusively confirmed by the Viévil and Rouen packs.

The trumps in the Viévil pack bear Roman numerals, not enclosed in panels, set at the top of the card in positions varying between the centre and the left-hand corner. Like those of Catelin Geoffroy, they lack inscriptions giving their names; but most of these can be gathered from a sentence which appears on the Ace of Coins and is continued on the 2 of Cups, into which have been worked the names of the majority of the trump subjects.[31] These subjects include the Pope (V) and Popess (II), which were replaced by others in the Belgian Tarot. The Popess is very much as in the Tarot de Marseille, but the Pope is rather different; he wears a mitre instead of the tiara, and holds a crozier instead of a cross, and two cardinals, whose faces can be seen, kneel before him. The two other cards which differ completely from the Belgian Tarot are the Chariot and the World. Both resemble the Tarot de Marseille designs. As in the Tarot de Marseille, the World shows a figure within an oval wreath, with the symbols of the four Evangelists in the corners of the card; the figure is male, however, and, at the bottom, the lion occupies the left-hand, the ox the right-hand, corner. The Chariot is not drawn by horses, but by beasts with human heads. The rest of the trumps, though much better drawn than in most Belgian Tarot packs, are very close to them in design. In particular, as in all the Belgian Tarots, the figure of the Hanged Man (XII) is, judging by the numeral on the card, the wrong way up, that is to say, upright instead of hanging by the feet; trump XIIII (Temperance) is inscribed FAMA SOL, as in the Belgian packs; and, again as in the Belgian Tarots, trump XVI, which is called *La Foudre* (the Lightning) on the 2 of Cups, shows a young man walking towards a tree, under which goats are sheltering and which is being struck by lightning. Trumps XVII to XX are also characteristic of what became the Belgian pattern. The Star (XVII) shows a man in a chair with a pair of compasses; the Moon (XVIII) shows a woman with a distaff; the Sun

---

are, if I have understood correctly, no present plans. In each pack, or at least in those I saw, each page has four cards mounted on it; in the case of the suit cards, the four of one given rank, in that of the trumps, consecutively numbered ones. It was among such separated pages that Madame Lambert discovered the missing cards of the Viévil pack.

[31] The inscription on the Ace of Coins reads: PERE SAINCT FAIT MOY YUSTICE DE CE VIELART MA E BAGA AMOVREVX DE CESTE DAME QVY SOIT CRYE A SON DE TROMPE PAR TOVT LE MONDE DE PAR LE PAPE LA PAPESSE LANPEREVR LINPERATRYCE LE SOLEIL, and continues on the 2 of Cups: L'A LVNE LES ETOILLES L'A FOVDRE PRINS A FORCE QVY SOIT PENDV E TRANNAY AV DYABLE.

(XIX) shows a naked boy on a horse with a pennant; and the angel's trumpet on the XX has a flag attached to it. Among the minor differences from the Belgian Tarot may be noted the following. The Hermit does not wear a Franciscan girdle, and holds the corner of his robe in his left hand; in his right hand he holds, not a book, but an indeterminate cigar-shaped object. The figure on the XVII holds a book in his right hand with an hourglass design on the cover. There are droplets on the XVII and XVIII, and no stars on the latter. The Fool bears neither inscription nor numeral. The court cards also resemble those of the Belgian Tarot, save for minor details, for instance that the coin which forms the suit-symbol on the King of Coins is in the crook of the King's left knee, where he holds it with his left hand.

The names of the trumps given on the Ace of Coins and 2 of Cups are for the most part what one would expect, save that the Hermit is called the Old Man (spelled *Vielart*) and the Judgment the Trumpet (*Trompe*). The figure on the trump I, corresponding to the Italian *Bagatto*, usually called the Mountebank (*Bateleur*), is here called the *Baga*, a term still in use among Tarot players in Chambéry at the beginning of this century. Perhaps the most striking feature of the Viévil pack is one that it does not share with the Belgian Tarot pattern, nor with any other known Tarot pack made outside Italy, namely the order in which its trump subjects are arranged; Viévil's order differs from that of the Tarot de Marseille in respect of trumps VII to XI inclusive. In the Tarot de Marseille the order runs Chariot (VII), Justice (VIII), Hermit, (IX), Wheel of Fortune (X) and Strength (*la Force*) (XI); in Viévil's pack it runs Justice (VII), Chariot (VIII), Strength (IX), Wheel of Fortune (X) and Hermit (XI). It is tempting to conjecture that we do not really have, in the reconstituted set of Viévil cards, a single pack, but a composite comprising the numeral cards from one pack and the court cards and trumps from another. But this conclusion would very probably be a mistake. Though the Aces of Swords and Batons are rather similar in the Tarot de Marseille and in the Belgian Tarot, the positions of the hands holding the weapons are, on both cards, reversed in the two patterns; and, although the Viévil pack agrees with the Tarot de Marseille in having droplets on the two cards, it agrees with the Belgian Tarot in respect of the positions of the hands. It is thus not wholly true that the numeral cards coincide in design with those of the Tarot de Marseille; and we shall see that, in several respects, those of the Rouen pack are intermediate between Viévil's and the Belgian ones. The cards of the reconstituted pack are all of the same size (125 x 63 mm); the individual style of the cardmaker seems constant throughout; at some former time they were all classified as belonging to the same pack; features in common with the Tarot de Marseille are not confined to the numeral cards. For all these reasons, adequate ground is lacking for doubting the unity of the pack as reconstituted by Mme Lambert. Even if the trumps and court cards were held to come from a distinct pack, it would not be of major import: we should still have an ancestor of the Belgian pattern, presumably French and certainly of the seventeenth century.

The other seventeenth-century Parisian pack, usually assigned to the early part of the century, is evidently non-standard; but it, too, has some affinity to the Belgian Tarot pattern. The 2 of Coins and the 2 and 3 of Cups all bear inscriptions saying FAICT A PARIS PAR (made in Paris by), the name of the maker having in each case been deleted; the 4 of Coins similarly has PAR ... A PARIS. The pack is linked with Viévil's by having exactly the same back design, consisting of hexagons each containing a black cross like a Maltese one but with three points at the ends of the arms, the intersection of the arms being left white save for an X. There is no danger of any confusion between the two packs, however, since the measurements of the non-standard pack are different (127 x 69 mm). Each card has a double chequered border, unlike the plain rectangle that appears on the Viévil cards, and each has an index on a scroll, supported by two beasts, just under the top border. The suit cards have indices consisting of the initial letter of the suit and a numeral or initial letter for the rank; the trumps have the usual Roman numerals. In addition, the trumps, court cards and Aces have their names inscribed at the bottom in full; the words used for the King, Queen, Cavalier, Jack and Ace are *Roy*, *Royne*, *Chevalier*, *Varlet* and *Ar*. The Swords are broad-bladed cutlasses, the Batons irregular trimmed branches; both are arranged, especially on the higher numerals, in a very eccentric way. The Aces each show an animal bearing a flag on which the suit-sign appears; a unicorn for

Swords, a winged centaur for Batons, a lion for Coins and a stag for Cups. The designs of the court cards and trumps have, for the most part, no particular resemblance to those of any known standard pattern. There are two exceptions. The Hanged Man (XII) is quite close in design to that of the Tarot de Marseille, while the World (XXI), unlike that of the Viévil pack, is strikingly similar to that of the Belgian Tarot. The World is represented by a naked figure standing on a globe divided into three parts, one showing the sun, one the moon and stars and the third the earth. The following cards are notable. The Bateleur (I), wearing a fool's costume, is seated at a table with one seated and one standing figure; the Chariot (VII) is drawn by swans; the Hermit (IX) holds a large rosary and a lantern; XVI is called *La Fouldre* (the Lightning) and shows a hell-mouth with a devil and cowering or fleeing figures; the Star (XVII) shows a scholar with a pair of compasses; the Moon (XVIII) shows a woman with a distaff, and, on the right, a church tower with a figure at the top; the Sun (XIX) shows a monkey holding a mirror up to a woman – a representation of vanity. There is an obvious iconographical connection of the XVI with that of the Geoffroy pack, and of XVII and XVIII with the Viévil one, but no detailed resemblance of design. The trumps are arranged in the same order as in the Tarot de Marseille.

Despite certain connections with the Belgian pattern, this pack by the anonymous seventeenth-century Parisian cardmaker was evidently another non-standard luxury pack. The pack made in Rouen and owned by David Temperley is, by contrast, a second example, after Viévil's, of the standard pattern which came to be associated with Belgium, and agrees with the Belgian cards in all the major respects in which Viévil's pack differs. Its maker's name is given on the Ace of Coins as Adam C. de Hautot, living in the rue du Gros Orloge in Rouen.[32] D'Allemagne lists several members of the de Hautot family of Rouen cardmakers, all of the eighteenth century, including one Adam de Hautot, active between 1760 and 1775;[33] but he also mentions an A. de Hautot as a founder member of the confrérie (charitable association) of cardmakers established in 1658.[34] Gurney Benham also lists several eighteenth-century members of the family, including a Charles de Hautot, active between 1715 and 1747, and an Adam de Hautot, active between 1747 and 1761, who is probably identical with the one mentioned by D'Allemagne.[35] From him we further learn of a Richard de Hautot, recorded as working in 1671, and of a 'Master Dehoto', attempting to work as a cardmaker in England in 1648, and evidently one of those who, as the 1623 remonstrance complained, had been forced by the tax laws to emigrate to England;[36] and we also learn of an Adam de Hautot active in Rouen between 1658 and 1707, evidently the same as the A. de Hautot mentioned by D'Allemagne. The cards of Temperley's pack have a definite general appearance of ones made in the seventeenth, not the eighteenth, century. The probability therefore is that the pack was made by the earlier of the two Adam de Hautots,[37] some time in the second half of the seventeenth century; our discussion will proceed on this assumption.

The de Hautot pack is almost complete, and contains all the trumps.[38] Save for certain details, it conforms precisely to the pattern later found in Belgium. Above all, the Pope and Popess have already been replaced by two figures never found in other forms of Tarot pack: trump V shows Bacchus, and trump II the Spanish Captain, Capitano Fracasse, a character from the Commedia dell'Arte whose identification I owe to my son Andy Dummett.[39] He has also shown that the design of the Spanish Captain in the Belgian Tarot pack has been copied from an early seventeenth-century engraving of the character by Michel Lasne.[40] This by itself should suggest that the eighteenth-century Belgian Tarot had a seventeenth-century prototype; and, indeed, the Spanish Captain of de Hautot's pack is even more obviously modelled upon Michel Lasne's engraving. The trump cards of the pack all bear their names at the bottom, as well as numerals at the top, as in the Belgian Tarot; the court cards also have their names in full. The name of the Spanish Captain is correctly given (save for the single S) as *Capitano Fracase*; in Belgian packs it is almost invariably misspelled *Capitano Eracasse*. The order of the trumps is, with one exception, the same as in the Belgian Tarot, and thus, save for the differences of subject, as in the Tarot de Marseille. The exception is that the positions of the Emperor and Empress have been reversed, the Emperor being trump III and the Empress trump IIII. It might be thought that this was a mere error; but we shall later see reason to consider it intentional. The Hanged Man (XII) is again shown the wrong way up, i.e. with the figure upright, its intended orientation being indicated not only by the numeral but by the name inscribed on the card; it will be recalled that this inversion is found both in Viévil's pack and in all Belgian Tarots. The Lightning (XVI) is inscribed *La Foudre* and is as in the Viévil pack and the Belgian Tarot, showing a man approaching a tree struck by lightning, but no tower. The World (XXI) closely resembles that of the anonymous Parisian pack and that of the Belgian Tarot: the numeral is flanked by the two animal supporters found on all cards in the anonymous pack, as also happens on the XXI in Belgian Tarot packs. The Chariot (VII) is again as in the Belgian Tarot, and the Fool is numbered XXII, as it always is in the Belgian packs, and is inscribed *Le Fol* (sometimes *Le Fou* on the Belgian cards). All the cards have the double chequered border of the anonymous Parisian pack, instead of the linear frame of Viévil; in the Belgian packs this has usually been reduced to a single chequered or dogtooth border. A curious detail is that the name of Temperance (XIIII) has been misspelled ATRENPANCE, like the ATREMPANCE found in the anonymous Parisian pack and in some, but not all, Belgian packs, for instance in one made by Jean Galler of Brussels (active 1738 to 1760).[41] As in the Belgian Tarot, there is a bird on the 2 of Swords and a crown on the 3 of Swords; the 2 of Coins has, as in the Belgian pack, lost the S-shaped scroll. The back design is of a common type, consisting of hexagons enclosing a sun with a face, often found on Belgian Tarots, for instance on examples of that by Galler and that by Vandenborre.[42]

---

[32] Anyone who has been in Rouen will know that the rue du Gros Horloge is the most famous street in that beautiful city. The inscription concludes 'au Coeur Royal', this being the sign of de Hautot's workshop; the 2 of Coins has 'Cartes de Adam de Hautot au Coeur Roy'.

[33] D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 138, 610.

[34] Ibid., vol. II, p. 139.

[35] W. Gurney Benham, *Playing Cards*, London, 1931, p. 63.

[36] Evidently the national xenophobia was already at work, since the Company of Makers of Playing Cards fined Master Richard Robinson for giving work to 'divers foreigners and strangers to the trade', including Dehoto. Life cannot have been easy in England for the immigrants from Rouen.

[37] Putting together the information from D'Allemagne and Gurney Benham, we obtain the following details of members of the de Hautot family: Dehoto, 1648; Adam de H., 1658-1707; Richard, 1671; Charles, 1715-47; Adam, 1747-75; Maurice, 1755-87; the Veuve de H., 1756; Pierre de H. le jeune, 1760-91; Louis-Amable de H., 1763-90; Benjamin, 1766-88.

[38] Missing are the 4, 8 and 10 of Batons, the 9 of Swords, the 6 and 8 of Cups, and the 7 of Coins.

[39] See Andy Dummett, 'The Spanish Captain', *Journal of the Playing-Card Society*, vol. III, no. 2, November 1974, pp. 7-8.

In certain respects, de Hautot's pack resembles Viévil's rather than the Belgian ones. Thus there are droplets on the Aces of Swords and Batons, missing on the Belgian cards. These droplets also appear on de Hautot's Moon (XVIII), as on that of Viévil; in Galler's pack, they have turned into something like feathers, and, in one by F.I. Vandenborre of Brussels (active 1726 to 1803), into stars.[43] More importantly, the 2 of Cups retains its dragon-heads, to which, indeed, scaly necks have been attached; in Belgian packs, they have been converted into flowers. In other respects, it is transitional. Thus the figure on the Star (XVII) holds an hour-glass, in place of the book with an hour-glass design on the cover, as in Viévil's pack; this hour-glass has disappeared in the Belgian Tarot. The Ace of Coins and 2 of Cups lack the curious inscription found on Viévil's cards, but the latter of these cards has acquired the inscription to be seen on all Belgian examples reminding the player that in Cups and Coins the lower-numbered cards beat the higher-numbered ones.[44] The cards are described on the Ace of Coins as 'Cartes de Taros Tres Fines', and not as 'Cartes de Suisse', as they usually are in Belgian packs, on this card or on the wrapper –

---

[40] The engraving is illustrated by Giacomo Oreglia, *The Commedia dell'Arte*, translated by Lovett F. Edwards from the original Italian edition of 1961, London, 1968, plate 38; see also Andy Dummett, op. cit.

[41] For an illustration, see Kaplan, op. cit., p. 152; six cards, not including Temperance, are shown by Hoffmann, op. cit., plate 16a.

[42] See Kaplan, p. 8.

[43] Carta Mundi, of Turnhout, issued in 1974 a reproduction of Vandenborre's Tarot pack; for illustrations, see Kaplan, pp. 6, 145, 284.

[44] In Belgian Tarot packs, this always runs, 'Pour conoistre que la plus basse de Deniez et de Coupes enporte les plus hautes quand au fait du jeu'; de Hautot's wording is almost identical, namely 'Pour conoistre que la plus basse de Deniers et de Coupe enporte les plus haute quand pour le fait du jeu'.

perplexingly, since there is no known connection between this pattern and Switzerland. In particular, the shape of the Batons on the numeral cards is half-way between that in Viévil's pack and in the Belgian Tarot. The Batons are rounded, rather than flat, in which respect they resemble the Belgian ones; but they retain the widened tips found in the Tarot de Marseille and in Viévil's pack. The Batons in the Belgian Tarot are simply straight rounded sticks, of uniform width from end to end, and have a striking resemblance to those found in the Tarocco Bolognese and in the Primiera Bolognese pattern for the regular Italian-suited pack.

In regard to a few details, de Hautot's pack seems not to be on a direct line between Viévil's and the Belgian Tarot. Thus the Ace of Cups is even more rounded than its Belgian counterpart, and has a circular, not octagonal, base; two fronds sprout from the stem. Cupid, on trump VI, has the bow and arrow oddly missing in Viévil's pack and in the Belgian ones. The figure of Justice in de Hautot's pack has unmistakable wings, whereas the corresponding details in Viévil's pack and in the Belgian Tarot could equally well be parts of a chair-back, which is presumably what they were originally meant to be; this mistake frequently occurs on this card in Tarot de Marseille-derived packs such as the Lombard pattern. De Hautot's Wheel of Fortune shows a man's head at the left, where both Viévil and the Belgian Tarot have a donkey, and, unlike both Viévil and the Belgian cardmakers, de Hautot puts no flag on the angel's trumpet on trump XX. De Hautot's Hermit holds nothing in his right hand, whereas, in the Belgian packs, he holds a book; the right leg of de Hautot's Hanged Man is not even attached to the crosspiece of the (inverted) gallows, as it is in the Belgian Tarots.

These packs have been described in detail because those by Viévil and de Hautot have previously been unknown, save for a few of the Viévil cards; and they radically alter our picture of the history of the Italian-suited Tarot pack in France. Quite obviously the two packs testify to the existence in France of a tradition of design distinct from the Tarot de Marseille; one which, by the seventeenth century, overlapped with it only in respect of the numeral cards of the suits and a few of the trump cards, and which underwent a quite independent evolution. It seems probable, for two reasons, that the pattern had already been in existence for a considerable time before Viévil made the earliest surviving example of it. First, there is the mistake about the orientation of the Hanged Man, a mistake occasionally found in some other packs, for instance, in one seen by Court de Gébelin and in a Minchiate pack now in the Correr Museum in Venice, but in no other case incorporated into a standard pattern. If Viévil's Hanged Man is turned the other way up to that intended by its maker, the crosspiece of the gallows can be seen very convincingly to rest in a fork of one of the uprights. The design must therefore have been very accurately copied from one originally made by a cardmaker who understood what the card was supposed to represent; or, if not, Viévil himself must have understood this, but have been too constrained by tradition to invert the design. Secondly, the substitution of Bacchus and the Spanish Captain for the Pope and Popess seems likely to have occurred at a time close to the date of Michel Lasne's engraving, from which the Spanish Captain design was rather exactly copied. If so, it must have been made, in some versions of this pattern, in the early seventeenth century, and so before Viévil's career began. Exactly what role the anonymous Parisian pack had in its subsequent evolution is unclear; possibly the design of the World was not copied directly from it. In view of the absolute identity of the back designs, it is possible that both packs came from the same studio, and that Viévil himself or some associate or successor issued other versions of the pattern in which the alternative design for the World was used. But, in the main, we have a fairly straightforward development from Viévil to, say, Vandenborre.

The Tarot de Marseille itself, celebrated as the characteristic standard French pattern for the Italian-suited Tarot pack, and produced in large numbers during the eighteenth century, has left surprisingly few early traces. The sheet in the Toulouse museum might possibly be from a Tarot de Marseille pack: the catalogue assigns it to Toulouse and, tentatively, to the seventeenth century, without categorising it as from a Tarot pack of any kind.[45] However, being Italian-suited, including Cavaliers of Cups, Coins and Swords and Queens of Swords and Coins (all four court cards of Swords are present), and bearing inscriptions giving the titles of the cards in full, the Queen being called RENE, it must surely be. Unfortunately, I have not seen the sheet itself nor an illustration of it; in any case, one could not identify it as a Tarot de Marseille from the court cards alone. There is no other possible example of a Tarot de Marseille pack from before the eighteenth century. A pack made by Pierre Madenie of Dijon in 1709 in the British Museum may be a Tarot de Marseille, but, since the Fool and all the trumps are missing, it cannot be identified as that rather than as an example of the early Piedmontese pattern.[46] The earliest certain example of the Tarot de Marseille is not by a French, but by a Swiss, cardmaker, François Héri of Soleure (Solothurn), whose pack of 1718 is in the Swiss Landesmuseum in Zurich;[47] the earliest French example may be one by Jean Noblet, who worked in Paris between 1721 and 1760, the pack being now in the Bibliothèque Nationale.[48] But it would be a mistake to estimate the antiquity of the pattern from the accidents of survival. The Piedmontese and Lombard patterns are plainly derivatives of the Tarot de Marseille, not conversely, even though Jean Dodal's Piedmontese pattern pack may be earlier than any surviving example of the Tarot de Marseille; and the same is even more evidently true of the pattern known as the Tarot de Besançon, of which the earliest surviving example, several copies of which are known, one being in the Cincinnati Art Museum, was made by Johann Pelagius Mayer of Constance in about 1680.[49]

---

[45] See footnote 27.

The 1659 *Maison académique* informs its readers that 'the Swiss and the Germans do not ordinarily play at any other game' than *Taros*. We know, therefore, that it was well established in both countries by the mid-seventeenth century. It may have reached Switzerland direct from Italy at the same time that it arrived in France. But it is unlikely to have reached Germany much, if at all, before the seventeenth century; and when it did, it arrived there via French-speaking areas. So far as we know, the Italian-suited Tarot pack was known in Germany and the Habsburg dominions only in forms closely related to the Tarot de Marseille, such as the Tarot de Besançon and the Lombard pattern; invariably the trump and court cards bore their names in full, and invariably those names were printed in French. As in the case of eighteenth-century Lombardy and Piedmont, this fact is surely conclusive evidence that it was with such inscriptions that the Tarot pack first reached parts of Europe where neither French nor Italian was spoken. If Tarot cards without inscriptions had previously been known, then, while it is conceivable that the French custom of adding such inscriptions might later have been adopted, they would surely have been in German, not in French; the universal use, everywhere in Europe outside Italy, of the French language for these inscriptions compels us to suppose that it was in that form that the cards were first known in non-French-speaking lands (Italy of course excepted). Although our historical deductions are hampered by the paucity of surviving seventeenth-century Tarot cards of any kind, all this points firmly to the conclusion that the Tarot de Marseille must have crystallised into an established standard pattern, complete with inscriptions and with the trump order known from later examples, by 1600 at the latest.

The *Maison académique* speaks of the game of *Taros* as being much played in Lyons, Marseilles 'and other places' in France, and we have seen that it was played in Grenoble in the sixteenth century. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, we find it flourishing in the eastern part of France, above all in Dijon, Besançon and Chambéry. We saw also that it is possible, though not certain, that Lorraine was the first French-speaking region to which the game travelled from Italy. Lyons, Marseilles, Strasbourg and Besançon were all, at various times, great centres for the manufacture of Tarot cards. It is apparent from these facts that the game of Tarot took root in the eastern strip of what is now France, and continued to be tenaciously played there from its first introduction right down to modern times. During much of this era, the game has been largely or wholly unkown in the rest of France. This eastern strip, extending from Nancy in the North to Marseilles in the South, includes many areas politically independent of France when the game was first introduced. Lorraine became part of France only in 1766; Alsace was French from 1648 to 1870 and again from 1919; Franche Comté, in which Besançon is situated, came under the French crown in 1679; and Savoy, which included Chambéry, became French as late as 1880. To this eastern strip of France and contiguous French-speaking areas, in which Tarot has been continuously popular since the sixteenth century, should be added the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland, where the evolution of the game has been strongly influenced by developments in France. Tarot is a game almost always played only at a local level, that is, by players in a particular locality who do not play with those living even a short distance away; it is for this reason that such divergent traditions of play have evolved. We shall, for example, find, at the beginning of the present century, quite different traditions of play in Chambéry and Besançon. Nevertheless, we should probably see the entire eastern strip of France, with its French-speaking neighbours, as maintaining one very roughly unified tradition of Tarot play.

---

[46] F.M. O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of the Collection of Playing Cards bequeathed to the Trustees of the British Museum by the late Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, London, 1901, F-4.

[47] For an illustration, see the catalogue *Schweizer Spielkarten* to the exhibition at the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Zurich in 1978, no. 142.

[48] For a colour illustration, see D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. II, opposite p. 78.

[49] For illustrations, see C.P. Hargrave, *A History of Playing Cards*, New York, 1930, 1966, pp. 259, 261, and Kaplan, op. cit., p. 136; the date 1680 is not on any of the cards, but is assigned by Hargrave, pp. 259, 261, 266, who says on p. 262 that Mayer worked in Constance in the later part of the seventeenth century.

The name 'Tarot de Marseille' was given to the standard pattern which it denotes because, in the eighteenth century, Marseilles became the great centre for its production; we have no right to infer that it was in Marseilles that it originated. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to associate the pattern with the area just discussed, the eastern strip of France and the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland. Now we have seen that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Tarot packs were manufactured in Rouen, and, from the late sixteenth to the mid-eighteenth century, in Paris. We cannot immediately infer that these were made for local consumption. Parisian cardmakers supplied other regions of France, and Rouen was a great centre for the export of playing cards, particularly to England and the Low Countries; it is presumably for that reason that it was the pattern used by Adam de Hautot, and, doubtless, other Rouen cardmakers, that was adopted in Belgium.[50] Indeed, what became the English standard pattern for the regular French-suited pack, and is now the Anglo-American or International pattern, was originally the Rouen pattern. But this very fact about the English standard pattern has implications for the Belgian Tarot. The Rouen cardmakers did not export to England the type of cards there used, a type of which we now have no knowledge: they simply used their own local pattern for French-suited cards, and exported those, so successfully that it became the English pattern. In the same way, it is quite unlikely that de Hautot was conforming to a pre-existing Belgian type of design for the Tarot pack solely in order to make such packs for export. If we suppose that, then we have to presume that the game of Tarot, and the type of pack used for it, reached what is now Belgium by some route that did not lead through France, which is most unlikely. There is no indication that de Hautot's pack was made for export; but, even if it was, it almost certainly exemplified a pattern already used locally, or at least in some part of France. It is not that Rouen cardmakers employed what became the Belgian Tarot pattern because they wished to export their cards to the Spanish (subsequently Austrian) Netherlands; rather, Belgian players became accustomed to the pattern because they originally imported their cards from Rouen. Thus, even if we did not know of Viévil's pack, we should naturally conclude that what became the Belgian Tarot pattern was formerly used in some part of France.

If the pattern was originally a French one, but later came to be exclusively associated with Belgium and forgotten in France, the natural explanation is that it was used in some area in which the game of Tarot died out. This cannot be anywhere within the eastern strip of the country, because there the game did *not* die out. The most obvious hypothesis, therefore, is that the predecessor of the Belgian Tarot pattern was used in just those areas where we know it to have been manufactured, namely in Normandy and in Paris itself. The successive editions of the *Maison académique*, like the card-game books of the eighteenth century, were published in Paris and intended principally for the members of Parisian society; and although the text suggests that the game of Tarot was not, in 1659, very widely popular among the readers of the book, its mere inclusion, taken together with a substantial production of Tarot packs by Parisian cardmakers, prompts the supposition that, in the seventeenth century, Tarot was not confined to the eastern strip, but was known in Paris. The pattern exemplified by Viévil's and de Hautot's packs, though it came to be associated with Belgium, is not, therefore, best described as the Belgian Tarot; it would probably be better called the Paris or the Rouen Tarot.

---

[50] A report of 1696 mentions playing cards as one of the chief industries of Rouen, its products being exported to the North and to Spain and Portugal; see D'Allemagne, op. cit., vol. II, p. 122. A remonstrance by Rouen cardmakers against taxes in 1746 said that Rouen supplied Flanders, Artois, Hainault, the Low Countries, the greater part of Holland and the North; ibid., p. 126.

This conclusion is supported by an odd detail of the *Maison académique* account. We know that in one important respect the nomenclature associated with the Paris/Rouen/Belgian pattern differed from that used for the Tarot de Marseille; in the former, the trump XVI was called *La Foudre*, in the latter *La Maison Dieu*. We also know that in Viévil's pack the order of the trumps differs from that in the Tarot de Marseille, although, in the Belgian Tarot, and essentially in de Hautot's pack, the Tarot de Marseille order is observed. Probably the order found in Viévil's pack is the original one used in France, of which the Tarot de Marseille order was a subsequent modification. This modification had already occurred by the time Catelin Geoffroy produced his pack in 1557, since, although it is incomplete, the numbering of the Chariot as VII and the Hermit as IX is enough to determine that the order of the trumps corresponded to that of the Tarot de Marseille rather than to that of Viévil. It appears, however, that the Paris/Rouen pattern retained what I am here taking to have been the older trump order until about a century after the introduction of the modified one, before falling into line with the Tarot de Marseille in this respect. Now the *Maison académique* first describes several French forms of Tarot, and then concludes with a subsection describing the game as played in Switzerland. This concluding subsection contains a list of the trump cards, with their numbers; their nomenclature, and, with one minor exception, their order, tally with those of the Tarot de Marseille. That such a list should have been given at the beginning of the entire section on Tarot would have been in no way surprising, but it was not; it is incorporated into the subsection on the Swiss game, and those relating to the French games contain no such list. Why should this be? The most reasonable explanation is that readers of the book would already be familiar with a form of Tarot pack differing somewhat either in the ordering or in the nomenclature of the trumps, or both, and did not need to be told their names or numbers for the French games described; but that the Tarot de Marseille ordering and nomenclature, appropriate to the cards used by Swiss players, would have been unfamiliar to Parisian readers, and so needed exposition.

It thus appears a plausible conjecture that the game of Tarot was played in Normandy and in Paris from the mid-sixteenth century until the end of the seventeenth, and that players in those areas employed a standard pattern ancestral to the Belgian Tarot of the eighteenth century.[51] If so, the game certainly died out in those areas by about 1700; and this would explain why the pattern in question survived only in Belgium and not in France. The omission of the game from the card-game books produced in Paris after 1702 is one indication of this. We saw in Chapter 6 that the editor of the 1726 edition of Straparola's *Les facétieuses nuits* felt obliged to explain 'the game of Tarot' to his readers as 'a kind of card game now obsolete';[52] it was, of course, far from obsolete, but the comment demonstrates that, by that date, it must have become utterly forgotten in cultivated Parisian society. Later in the century, Court de Gébelin, in *Le Monde primitif*, vol. VIII, 1781, speaks (p. 365) of the game of Tarots as a 'game unknown indeed in Paris, but well known in Italy, in Germany and even in Provence'; he explains later (p. 381) that 'if it did not reach Paris, that must be attributed to the bizarre character of its designs and to the number of cards, things not of a kind to please the vivacious nature of French ladies'. It will be recalled that he first encountered the game being played by a party of Swiss ladies, whom, presumably, he regarded as less vivacious.

It would be wrong to treat the hypothesis here advanced concerning the Tarot de Marseille pattern and that which we have associated with Paris and Rouen too schematically. For one thing, the evidence at present available is too slender for us to be confident that new data, coming to light, will not alter the picture; for another, adherence to standard patterns sometimes varies, not with large regions, but with small localities.[53] The affinities of Catelin Geoffroy's pack are more with our 'Paris/Rouen' pattern than with the Tarot de Marseille, save for the trump order; the Tarot de Marseille order was known in seventeenth-century Paris, as the anonymous pack shows. It may be that Lyons cardmakers, too, produced some Tarot packs in accordance with the Paris/Rouen pattern; it may be that the latter pattern was quite widely used, in particular localities within the eastern strip, until the Tarot de Marseille gained the ascendancy in the eighteenth century. We must make the best sense of the evidence we can; but we must hold ourselves ready for alternative interpretations of it.

---

[51] The mention of Tarot by Claude Gauchet in 1583, cited in footnote 6, supports this. Gauchet (1540-*c.* 1622) was born in Dammartin or Dampmartin, 35 km. north-east of Paris, and spent much of his life there and at Senlis, and his early years at the courts of Charles IX and Henri III; the furthest he seems to have travelled from Paris was Bayeux in Normandy, where he served for a time as archdeacon.

[52] See footnote 12 of Chapter 6.

The one difference between the trump order as given in the *Maison académique* and that in all known examples of the Tarot de Marseille pack is that, as in the de Hautot pack, the Emperor is numbered 3 and the Empress 4; thus the cards from 2 to 5 run Popess (2), Emperor (3), Empress (4) and Pope (5), whereas, in all known Tarot de Marseille packs, they run Popess (II), Empress (III), Emperor (IIII) and Pope (V). Indeed, in all other known Tarot packs of any kind containing the Emperor and Empress and with a known ranking, the Emperor, as one would expect, ranks higher than his consort. But the coincidence makes it likely that the reversal of the order of the two Imperial figures that occurs in de Hautot's pack, but not in the eighteenth-century Belgian ones, was not due to any mistake; there may have been a vogue for this reversal during the seventeenth century, affecting both the Paris/Rouen pattern and the Tarot de Marseille. In any case, the list of trumps given in the *Maison académique* in connection with the Swiss game is itself evidence that the Tarot de Marseille was well established, at least in Switzerland, by 1659, since, the relative order of the Emperor and Empress apart, in no other form of Tarot pack do the trumps occur in precisely that order and with precisely those names, save in the Piedmontese and Lombard offshoots; in particular, they did not do so in the Tarot de Besançon, the other standard pattern known to have been used in Switzerland.

The description given in the *Maison académique* is very far from being either lucid or exhaustive, and I set out the games it describes according to the best understanding of the text at which I have been able to arrive, without full confidence that I have interpreted it correctly. It is not even quite clear how many distinct games it is intended to mention. One might, from one phrase, '*celuy qui a le plus de leuée, gaigne la partie*', suppose that there was first mentioned a *simple* trick-taking game, that is, one in which what counted, for win or loss, was simply the number of tricks taken by each player, irrespective of the cards contained in them, and that the values of the cards, stated in the next section but one, are intended to relate only to a different game. However, I reject this interpretation, since the phrase quoted above is preceded by a careful explanation of the role of the Fool as Excuse, including the practice of taking it back and giving a card in exchange for it, and there would be no point whatever in this latter practice in a simple trick-taking game in which it did not matter which particular cards one had in one's tricks at the end of play. As I understand the text, then, there are four games described, two very straightforward ones, one with the very unusual feature of a secondary trump suit, and one a gambling game in which the taking of tricks plays a very minor role.

The most natural reading of the text is that the simplified order was employed, i.e. that, in every suit, the Jack was followed by the 10 and the Ace was low, the order in Cups and Coins thus coinciding with that in Swords and Batons. The convention followed in this respect makes no difference whatever to the game; but it is surprising to find that some French players had adopted this simplification at so early a date. Although it is now universal in France, we know from the inscription on the 2 of Cups in de Hautot's pack that the original order, in which the numeral cards run in opposite directions in the two pairs of suits, was observed by some players in seventeenth-century France, presumably those of Normandy, as by those in Belgium. German and Swiss players almost always observed the original order, and, on the assumption that it was from France that the game spread to Germany, the adoption of the simplified order by French players cannot have been widespread until after it had done so. Indeed, until the early years of this century Tarot players in Besançon were still observing the original order. Probably it was a matter of quite local custom; the most that we can infer from the *Maison académique* account is that the simplified order prevailed in Paris.

---

[53] I remember noticing in one small town in Sicily, that the regular packs on sale in the shops and being used for play in the cafés were, by some quirk of history, of the Piacentine, not the Sicilian, pattern.

Seventeenth-century French Tarot (first version)

Terminology

The game is called *le jeu de Taros.* Trumps are called *triomphes,* the XXI *le Monde,* the I *le Basteleur* and the Fool *le Fou.*

Rank and values of the cards

The full 78-card Italian-suited pack is used. The trumps rank in ordinary numerical sequence, with the XXI (*Monde*) highest. In each suit the cards rank, in descending order, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, A. The *Fou* serves as Excuse (the phrase used is '*le Fou sert d'excuse*'); it can be played at any time, irrespective of any obligation to follow suit or trump, and is taken back and placed with the cards the player has won in tricks, another card from among those he has won in tricks being immediately given in exchange for it. (All this is stated quite explicitly.) It is obligatory to follow suit if one can, and, if one cannot, to play a trump if one can. The values of the counting cards are as follows:

The *Fou*	5 points
The *Monde*	4 points
The *Basteleur*	4 points
Each King	4 points
Each Queen	3 points
Each Chevalier	2 points
Each Jack	1 point

Deal and play

For the rest, the description of the game is extremely vague. It is expressly said that the number of cards to be dealt to each player can vary according to agreement. Each player plays for himself, but the number of players is also left unspecified. The dealer takes no more cards than the other players, and each player plays with the hand dealt to him, without discarding any cards. Deal and play are presumably counter-clockwise, and presumably also it is the player to the right of the dealer who leads to the first trick. At the beginning of the round, each player puts an agreed stake on the table; at the end of the round, each counts up the points on the cards he has won in tricks, and the one with the highest point-total takes all the stakes. The language used about the method of counting points is rather vague. It could be construed to mean that the only points are those on the counting cards; but it more probably means that a player counts 1 point for each trick he has taken, plus the points for the counting cards they contain.

Seventeenth-century French Tarot (second version)

The terminology, rules of play and rank of the cards are as in the preceding version. The only counting cards mentioned are the *Fou,* worth 5 points, and the Kings, worth 4 points each; but it is most likely that this is due only to the breathless style of exposition, and that we are intended to assume that all the values are as in the preceding game. Each player plays for himself, and each is dealt twelve cards; as before, the dealer takes no extra cards, and there is no discard. It is expressly stated that the number of players can vary (the maximum will be six), although later versions specify four. At the end of the round, each player who has won twelve or more cards in tricks counts 1 point for each card he has in excess of twelve, plus the values of his counting cards; a player who has won less than twelve cards in tricks subtracts from the total value of his counting cards the difference between 12 and the number of cards he has won (he may thus have a negative score). If necessary, a running total is kept from round to round, and the first player to attain a cumulative score of 50 points wins the game.

La rigueur

In the text, only the peculiarity of this game is explained, which is that the suit of Swords, called *la rigueur*, constitutes a secondary trump series. We may therefore take it to be played in other respects like either the first or the second version above. A trick is won by the highest proper trump played to it; or, if there is no proper trump, by the highest card of the Swords suit; or, if there is neither, by the highest card of the suit led. As usual, a player must follow suit if he can, including playing a trump if trumps are led and playing a Sword if Swords are led. If Swords are led, and he cannot follow suit, he must as usual play a trump if he can. If a plain suit is led, and he cannot follow suit, he must play either a trump or a Sword if he can.

Triomphe forcée

This is a mere gambling game, played by an indefinite number of players; it would be practicable for between four and ten. Each player puts up a stake, and then each is dealt five cards. If any player has *la Mort* (trump XIII) in his hand, he declares it immediately, and takes all the stakes; there is then a new deal by the next dealer. Otherwise, each player in turn, starting with the one on the dealer's right, declares whether he has one or more of *le Fou*, *le Basteleur* (trump I) and *la Force* (trump IX in Viévil's ordering, XI in others). A player holding either the *Fou* or the *Basteleur* receives back the value of his stake; one having *la Force* receives twice the value of his stake; one holding two or all three of these cards gets the combined sum. If no stakes are left on the table at the end of these declarations, there is then a new deal. If any stakes are left, the hands are played out in tricks, under the usual rules. The player who obtains the greatest number of tricks obtains the remaining stakes; if two players have each won two tricks, the stakes go to the one who first won two tricks; if all five tricks have been won by different players, the stakes go to the player who first won a trick. It is not made clear whether the players' stakes must all be equal, or whether each can choose the size of his stake; the former seems more likely.

Triomphe forcée is of course not on the main line of development of Tarot games; it is merely one of those gambling games which will always be devised with any pack of cards that is in regular use. The game of *la rigueur* displays the kind of inventiveness often found in the history of games in a vigorous condition that are not regarded as having yet been developed to perfection; but the particular idea of a secondary trump suit was not to bear any fruit. But, for the rest, the *Maison académique* account, written about a century and a half after the introduction of Tarot into France, appears to display the game in a surprisingly primitive stage of development, of which the most striking is that not all the cards are dealt out, and that no one takes extra cards and discards a corresponding number. These features, present in almost every other known form of Tarot game, are found in Swiss Tarot, as described in the *Maison académique* and set out in the next chapter. We have seen that there appear to have been two different traditions of design for the Tarot pack in France, distinct though interacting with one another; one probably prevailing in Paris and Normandy, and continued in Belgium; the other the tradition of the Tarot de Marseille, prevailing in Switzerland and presumably in the entire eastern strip of France and adjacent French-speaking areas, and the source for the designs of all Italian-suited Tarot cards used in Germany and Central Europe. We have seen, too, that the game of Tarot had, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, died out in the area where the Paris/Rouen pattern was in use; perhaps it lingered for some time in Normandy after it had been forgotten in Paris, but probably not for very long. As we shall see, the Swiss game described in the *Maison académique* is precisely of the kind we should in any case have guessed to be ancestral to those later played with the 78-card pack in Germany, Austria, France and northern Italy, whereas those which the book describes as played in France itself seem quite remote from any line of evolution we should expect. The probability is, therefore, that there were associated with the two traditions of design two distinct traditions of play, and that the French Tarot games described in the *Maison académique* belong to that tradition which prevailed in Normandy and Paris, subsequently to die out in France. This conjecture would be confirmed if forms of Tarot play continuous with this tradition could be shown to have been followed in eighteenth-century Belgium; unfortunately, I know of no source that describes the game as played in that part of the Netherlands, while Dutch sources give accounts of games strongly influenced by German or later French modes of play. If the conjecture is correct, it is probable that the type of Tarot game played, in the seventeenth century, in the eastern part of France, in which the game was to have a continuous history, was much closer to that described in the *Maison académique* as that ordinarily played by the Swiss than to the games presented as played in France.

CHAPTER TEN

Swiss Tarot, Tarock or Troccas

In the catalogue *Schweizer Spielkarten* to the exhibition of Swiss playing cards held in Zurich in 1978, Dr Balz Eberhard states (p. 181) that Tarot cards arrived in Switzerland from France at the beginning of the eighteenth century. It is apparent from the description of the Swiss game in the *Maison académique* of 1659 that this dating is too late; as previously noted, the author claimed that the Swiss, like the Germans, did not ordinarily play any other game than Tarot. Although this is obviously a wild exaggeration, it testifies to the great popularity that the game had in mid-seventeenth-century Switzerland; it also disproves the suggestion sometimes made, that Tarot was brought to Switzerland by Huguenot emigrants from France, since this emigration did not begin on any large scale until 1682, in response to the persecution by Louis XIV. Eberhard observes that in the eighteenth century Tarot was played in every part of the country, adding that it was particularly popular in the higher ranks of society; he cites as an example the fondness of Johann Bernoulli II (1710-1790), professor of mathematics at the University of Basle, for playing the game with his students. We cannot put the arrival of the game of Tarot in Switzerland later than the beginning of the seventeenth century. As explained later, there is reason to conjecture that it arrived there independently from Italy a hundred years earlier yet, at the same time that it reached France.

From at least the eighteenth century on, many Tarot packs were made in Switzerland. Ones employing the Tarot de Marseille pattern, or slight variations on it, were made for the mainly Protestant French-speaking cantons. In the German-speaking cantons, and no doubt particularly in the Catholic ones, the Tarot de Besançon was used instead. The name used for this standard pattern is due to its production by various cardmakers of Besançon at around the beginning of the nineteenth century, but there is no reason to suppose that it originated there; as already remarked, the earliest surviving example was made in *c.*1680 by Johann Pelagius Mayer of Constance. The Tarot de Besançon is plainly a variant of the Tarot de Marseille, and, like it, has inscriptions on the court cards and trumps giving their names in full. Since in Switzerland, as in Germany, these inscriptions are invariably in French, it is to be presumed that the game of Tarot was first played in Switzerland in the French-speaking cantons, and only later spread from there to the German-speaking ones. Most cards of the Tarot de Besançon resemble those of the Tarot de Marseille, and some of the minor variations are shared with the Piedmontese variant, such as the full face on the Moon (trump XVIII), the droplets on the Judgment (trump XX) and the use of the term *Le Fol* instead of *Le Mat* for the Fool. The furry trousers worn by the Devil (trump XV) are shared with the Lombard variant. The Ace of Cups shows a rounded cup with a lid in place of the Gothic chalice of the Tarot de Marseille, and a minor but distinctive detail is that the Jack of Batons has his hands close together instead of spaced apart. More surprising is the fact that the Queens are standing instead of seated; but by far the most characteristic feature is the replacement of the Pope and Popess on trumps V and II by Jupiter and Juno respectively. We have already seen the

Pope and Popess replaced by other figures in de Hautot's pack and in the Belgian Tarot, and we shall later note their disappearance from various Italian forms of the Tarot pack. It is evident that, to Catholics in many areas, these figures gave offence; to use the Emperor as a playing card was permissible, but to use the Pope in the same way was dubious, and to give him a consort appeared an outrage. An illustration of the strength of feeling this could arouse is provided by a Tarot pack made in Prague now in the Bibliothèque Municipale in Rouen.[1] This employs the Lombard pattern, which of course includes the Pope and Popess among the trumps. Milan was awarded to Austria at the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, and we shall find that Milanese fashions in Tarot play had a strong influence in eighteenth-century Austria; a Lombard pattern pack made in Wels at the end of the eighteenth century is now in the British Museum.[2] The pack now at Rouen has the usual inscriptions in French on the trumps and court cards, and, on the 2 of Cups, the inscription IN BRAG. It is in a carton, which it fits exactly, and which the catalogue states to be of German manufacture. The carton has a fine marbled exterior, and bears a label with an engraved design enclosing a hand-written note in German in what I should judge to be an eighteenth-century hand. The note reads, 'A rare Tarock pack for which the maker was beheaded on account of a satirical figure painted on it', and what may be a later addition to this inscription refers to trump no. II.[3] The catalogue assigns the pack to the seventeenth century, but it can hardly be earlier than 1760. If the story is true, the unfortunate cardmaker was unjustly executed, since he was intending no satire, but merely copying the Italian prototype of the pattern he was following. I do not know whether, at that date, so harsh a punishment is likely to have been inflicted for so minor an offence, even if it had been intentional; but, whether true or false, the story exemplifies the sort of reaction to the figure of the Popess that could be thought intelligible. It was no doubt because of this reaction that the Tarot de Marseille itself seems to have been confined to French-speaking areas: it was the Tarot de Besançon which was used, not only in the German-speaking cantons of Switzerland, but also in Germany itself.

The *Maison académique* gives a sketchy description of a form of Tarot as being ordinarily played by the Swiss; but the description is sufficiently detailed for us to recognise the game as of just the type which later became standard, with no complications in the way of declarations of combinations of cards held in the hand before play, or of special bonuses for particular feats effected during play.

Seventeenth-century Swiss Tarot

There are three players. Each receives twenty-five cards, and the dealer takes in addition the last three cards for himself. He then discards any three cards of his choice, putting them face down beside him: these cards count for him at the end of the round just as if they had formed a trick he had won in play. (In almost all forms of Tarot in which such a discard is made, there are restrictions on the cards that may be discarded: at the very least, the dealer may not discard the Fou, the XXI (Monde), the I (Basteleur) or a King; often he may not discard any trump. No such restriction is stated in the *Maison académique* account, but this is more likely than not to be an oversight.) Each of the three players plays for himself; a game (*partie*) consists of three rounds, so that each deals once. The terminology given is as in the French games described in the last chapter; trumps are called *triomphes*, the Fool *le Fou*, the XXI *le Monde* and the I *le Basteleur*. The values of the cards are:

The XXI (Monde)	5 points
The I (Basteleur)	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Chevalier	3 points
The Fou	3 points

An obvious eccentricity is that the Jacks are apparently treated as low cards; but it is just as likely that they were in fact worth 2 points, and that the failure to mention them is just a piece of carelessness on the part of the author. The method of counting points is not stated; but, from the fact that, apart from the Fou and perhaps the Jacks, the value of each counting card is one higher than in the contemporary French game, the most probable hypothesis is that the cards were counted in threes, in the sense explained in Chapter 8: that is, that three low cards together count 1 point, three cards containing a single counting card together count the value of that counting card, two counting cards and a low card count one less than the sum of values of the counting cards, and three counting cards count two less than the sum of their values. Nothing special is said about the order of the cards in the suits, from which one would naturally infer that it was as in the French game; but, since in the modern game the original order is respected, it is probable that it was also observed in the seventeenth century, and that this represents another oversight by the author. The Fou is explicitly stated to serve as Excuse; it can therefore be played at any time, regardless of obligation to follow suit or to trump, and is withdrawn from the trick and added to the cards won by the player, from among which he immediately selects a card to be given in exchange. It is to be presumed that the standard rules of play apply, that deal and play are counter-clockwise and that the player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. Each player records his score in points at the end of each round, and keeps a running total; the player with the highest total at the end of the three rounds wins the game.

---

[1] The pack is in the Leber Collection, catalogue no. 1351-XXIII.

[2] G-294 in O'Donoghue's catalogue.

[3] The inscription reads, 'Eine seltne Tarock-Karte, darum der Verfertiger wegen einer dazu gemalten satyrischen Figur enthauptet worden', and below 'N° // Fig: No: II', as best I can read it.

Early in the second half of the eighteenth century there occurred an event of the highest importance for the history of playing cards, though of no importance whatever for the history of Tarot as a game. In the Tarot pack, the Italian suits of Swords, Batons, Cups and Coins were replaced by the French suits of Spades, Clubs, Hearts and Diamonds. The court cards – King, Queen, Cavalier and Jack – remained the same; the black suits were regarded as corresponding to the 'long' Italian suits of Swords and Batons, and the red ones as corresponding to the 'round' suits of Cups and Coins, so that, in Spades and Clubs, the cards ranked, in descending order, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, A, while in Hearts and Diamonds they ranked K, Q, C, J, A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. With this change of suit-system, the old subjects disappeared from the trump cards. The Fool remained a fool or jester of some kind; but the traditional subjects on the trumps proper were replaced by arbitrary designs. At first by far the most popular subjects for the trump cards in these new French-suited Tarot packs were different species of animals. Later there were used instead rural and domestic scenes. At the whim of the cardmaker, designs of any kind might be employed for the trumps: famous buildings, flowers, characters from drama or fiction, or even satirical political cartoons. French-suited Tarot packs became the principal vehicle by which cardmakers could display their skill at creating new designs, unfettered by tradition: all that the card player required was that the number of each trump be plainly marked upon it, and he identified it by number alone. At no stage did any of the new designs serve as the means by which the trump card was identified: even in the animal packs, the cards were never called by the names of the animals represented on them, and so the manufacturer could alter the selection of animals or their order without the card players' even noticing. The only exception to this is that the lowest trump, the I, the Bagatto of the Italian pack, was very often depicted as some kind of pedlar, dancer or jester. Naturally, the practice, observed in all Italian-suited Tarot packs made outside Italy after the sixteenth century, of inscribing their names on the trump cards, was discontinued, and, with it, that of inscribing in full on the court cards their ranks and suits. In German-speaking areas, the XXI indeed usually continued to be known as *der Mond*, a corruption of the French *le Monde* or Italian *il Mondo* (the World): but the derivation of this name was wholly forgotten, with the result that, in some French-suited packs, the design on the XXI shows the Moon in the sky, *der Mond* in German meaning 'the Moon'.

The replacement of the traditional Italian-suited Tarot pack by the French-suited one seems first to have been carried out in Bavaria and in Austria and its non-Italian dominions in the 1750s, and, after about 1760, the Italian-suited pack became quite unknown in those areas. In Italy itself, except in Trieste, the Trentino and the French-speaking parts of Savoy, the French-suited Tarot pack was never viewed as acceptable. But, both in Belgium and in the rest of Germany, the Bavarian and Austrian example was followed from about 1760 onwards. In Belgium the French-suited pack quickly ousted the Italian-suited one. In Germany the Italian-suited pack continued to co-exist with the French-suited one down to the end of the eighteenth century, when it finally died out. In France, on the other hand, the French-suited Tarot pack did not make its appearance until the middle of the nineteenth century. In Switzerland many of the German-speaking cantons took to the use of the French-suited pack, with animals on the trumps, in about 1780. French-speaking ones, however, remained faithful to the Italian-suited form until around the end of the nineteenth century; the Tarot de Besançon pattern was replaced in Switzerland, in about 1860, by new designs based loosely on it and retaining Jupiter and Juno in place of the Pope and Popess on trumps V and II. The Tarot de Marseille continued to be produced in Switzerland until quite recent times. There seems to have been a gap between the French-suited 'animal' Tarot and the modern 'bourgeois' French-suited Tarot pack, with genre scenes on the trumps, which first appeared in Switzerland in the 1890s. It therefore seems that, after a period when the animal Tarot was in use among them, the German-speaking cantons reverted in the nineteenth century to the Italian-suited pack, in the form with Jupiter and Juno, which is still used by German- and Romansh-speaking players today; Switzerland is in fact the only country besides Italy where the Italian-suited Tarot pack remains in regular use for play. The 'bourgeois' Tarot, on the other hand, was introduced for use in French-speaking areas, where it has now completely replaced the Tarot de Marseille.

Apart from the brief account in the *Maison académique* , there are not, to my knowledge, any published descriptions of Swiss Tarot, and so it is impossible to follow the history of the game in that country. At the present time, the game has largely gone out of fashion; but Switzerland is a country in which local tradition is extremely tenacious, and it is therefore unlikely to be in any danger of dying out. As stated by Dr Eberhard in the catalogue already mentioned, and confirmed by the playing-card manufacturers AG Müller, it is now played only in four areas: in the canton of Graubünden (Grisons), the largest but least densely populated of all the Swiss cantons, a largely Protestant one of which about half the population is Romansh-speaking, Italian being spoken in a few districts and the rest speaking German; in the canton of Wallis (Valais), French-speaking and Protestant in the west, German-speaking and Catholic in the east; in the largely Catholic canton of Fribourg (Freiburg), similarly divided between French and German speakers, where, according to AG Müller, the game has almost died out and, according to Eberhard, is now principally confined to elderly ladies; and in certain villages of the Jura, presumably in the French-speaking Protestant cantons of Vaud and Neuchâtel. The Italian-suited pack is in use in Graubünden and Wallis, the French-suited one in Fribourg and the Jura villages, and two quite different types of game are played with the two kinds of pack. That played in Fribourg and the Jura with the French-suited pack is very close to modern French Tarot, and a description of it is therefore postponed until Chapter 15. The game played with the Italian-suited pack is peculiar to Switzerland; in response to an enquiry in 1968, AG Müller kindly sent me a duplicated description, in German, of this game, and have subsequently confirmed that the rules there given are followed by players in Graubünden and Wallis. A visit to Sedrun by Mr John McLeod in 1978, undertaken at my suggestion, provided the opportunity for observing the game as played there. Sedrun is in the Romansh-speaking part of Graubünden, being a ski resort in the Vorderrheintal. The game is called Troccas in Romansh, and is the principal card game played in Sedrun and the surrounding villages, having enjoyed something of a revival there recently. It is played by men and women of all ages, and tournaments are regularly held; there is, in particular, a women's Troccas club. McLeod was informed that the game is less popular in Disentis, but that players can be found as far down the valley as Ilanz. The players are unaware of the existence of the French-suited Tarot pack: the standard form of the game is a four-handed one, as is also stated in the Müller leaflet, and the version described in the leaflet resembles very closely that observed by McLeod, with certain differences stated below. The players at Sedrun attribute the introduction of the game to their region to the invasion by French troops in 1798. It is hard to say how much substance there may be to this tradition; in any case, the game, as played in Sedrun, and as described in the Müller leaflet, displays no French characteristics, and lacks the complications of bidding, bonuses and declarations, and therefore probably represents an indigenous Swiss tradition of a mode of play that has changed little since the seventeenth century.

German and Romansh terminology

The game is called *Tarock* in German and *Troccas* in Romansh. Trumps are called *Tarock* in German (invariable in the plural), and *Troccas* in Romansh. The suit of Coins is known as *Rosen* in German and *Rosas* in Romansh; that of Cups is called *Kelchen* in German and *Cupas* in Romansh. The suits of Swords and Batons are called *Spadas* and *Bastuns* in Romansh; the Müller leaflet does not cite the names of these suits. The Fool is called *der Narr* in German and *il Narr* in Romansh. The trump 21 is simply called *der einundzwanzigste* in German, but *il Mund* in Romansh; similarly, the trump 1 is called *der erste* in German but *il Bagat* in Romansh. The King is called *der König* in German and *il Retq* in Romansh; the Queen is called *die Königin* in German and *la Regina* in Romansh; the Cavalier is called *der Reiter* in German and *il Cavagl* in Romansh; and the Jack is called *der Bub* in German and *il Buob* in Romansh. The obvious German etymology of the Romansh terms *il Narr* and *il Buob* suggests, at the very least, that the game as played amongst Romansh speakers has been influenced by German-speaking players.

Modern four-handed Swiss Troccas or Tarock

Rank and values of the cards

An Italian-suited 78-card pack is used. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order: that is, in Swords and Batons, they rank, in descending order, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, A, and, in Cups and Roses (Coins), K, Q, C, J, A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. The trumps rank in their natural order, from 21 down to 1. The values of the counting cards are:

the 21	5 points
the 1	5 points
the Fool	5 points
each King	5 points
each Queen	4 points
each Cavalier	3 points
each Jack	2 points

The cards are counted in fours. The dealer's side will have two odd cards, which count as if there were four of them: that is to say, two odd low cards count together 1 point, two odd cards consisting of a counting card and a low card count together the value of the counting card, and two odd counting cards count together one less than the sum of their values. There are thus altogether 72 points.

Deal

There are four players, who are to play in two fixed partnerships. To determine partners, the Müller leaflet lays down that, after the top card has been placed in the middle of the table, the cards shall be dealt out, face up, one by one to each of the players in rotation; as soon as a trump is dealt to any player, he receives no more cards. When all the players have a trump, those with the two lowest trumps become partners, as do those with the two highest; the one with the lowest trump becomes the first dealer. The players arrange themselves so that partners are facing each other across the table.

According to the Müller leaflet, deal and play are counter-clockwise, and this is the practice at Sedrun; at Disentis, however, deal and play are clockwise. As is usual, the dealer shuffles and the player to his left (to his right when the deal is clockwise) cuts the pack. At Sedrun, it is usual for all the players to look at the card which is cut, which will become the bottom card of the pack; this rule is not stated in the Müller leaflet. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each of the other players, and twenty-one to himself. The normal method of dealing is as follows: the dealer gives six cards to each player in rotation, beginning with the one to his right (to his left when the deal is clockwise); he then gives six more cards to each; finally, he gives seven cards to each of the other three players, taking the remaining nine cards himself. The Müller leaflet states that the last card dealt to each player, including the dealer himself, may be dealt face up; this is the invariable practice at Sedrun, where the dealer's last card has already been seen when the pack was cut.

The Müller leaflet states that it is the practice in many places that, after each of the three rounds of the deal, including the final one, the players may propose that the deal be abandoned and that there be a new deal by the same dealer; but any player, including the dealer himself, may veto such a proposal. This is the practice at Sedrun, where, after each round of the deal, each player in turn, beginning with the one to the dealer's right, says whether he proposes that the deal be abandoned, until a player is reached who wishes it to continue (or play to proceed). It is in fact rare for the deal to be abandoned in this way. The Müller leaflet states that, if the dealer has no trump in his hand at the end of the deal, he may annul the deal, and deal afresh, even against the wishes of the other players; only the dealer has this privilege. So far as is known, this is not the practice at Sedrun.

According to the Müller leaflet, if, at the beginning of any deal, one side has a cumulative score of minus 9 game points or worse, that side may demand that the deal be in two rounds only, one of nine cards followed by one of ten cards each (the dealer taking twelve in the second round). If a side has a score of minus 18 game points or worse, the two partners may gather up their own cards from the preceding round in any order that they like, and, having cut the pack, demand that the dealer give out the cards in a single round (nineteen to each of the other players and twenty-one to himself). The rule at Sedrun is slightly different, namely that, if a side has a score of minus 14 game points or worse, that side may demand either method, a deal in two rounds or in a single round, as it wishes. If either of these exceptional methods of dealing is demanded, there is still an opportunity to propose that the hands be thrown in and the cards redealt after each round of the deal.

Discard

When the deal has been completed, the dealer has to discard two cards face down beside him to reduce his hand to nineteen cards. These cards count to his side at the end of the round as if there were four of them (see under *Rank and values of the cards*). According to the Müller leaflet, the general rule is that the dealer may discard a card worth 5 points only if he discards two such; but it remarks that some players do not allow him to discard such a card at all. This latter rule, that no 5-point card may be discarded, is that which is observed at Sedrun; but, according to the players there, there are villages lower down the valley where the dealer is allowed to discard a King or the trump 1 (*Bagat*), but not the 21 (*Mund*) or the Fool (*Narr*).

Play

The player to the right of the dealer (or the one to his left when play is clockwise) leads to the first trick. The *Narr* (Fool) serves as Excuse. If the opponents of the player who has the *Narr* win the trick to which he plays it, he takes it back and puts it with the cards won in tricks by his own side, immediately taking from them a low card to give in exchange for it; it is not allowed to give a card in exchange for the *Narr* from the dealer's discard. If the side playing the *Narr* has not yet won any tricks, they keep the *Narr* face up until they do so and can give a card in exchange. If the side that has the *Narr* make no tricks (in German terminology, is made *Matsch*), they must surrender the *Narr* to their opponents. It is legal to lead the *Narr* to a trick, in which case the next player may play any card, which determines the suit of the trick, to which the others have to follow suit if they can, or, if they cannot, to play a trump if they can. If the dealer's side fails to win a trick, it must surrender the dealer's discard to the opponents.

Play is under the usual rules, but there is a special rule unknown in any other type of Tarot game. This is stated in the Müller leaflet as follows. If a player plays the King of a suit to the first trick to which that suit is led, he may demand, when the trick is completed, that the Jack be played. If he makes this demand, then the player holding the Jack must surrender it, taking back into his hand a numeral card of that suit which has been played to the table. If, however, the player who holds the Jack has played the Queen or Cavalier of the suit to the trick, he takes back that court card in exchange for the Jack. The rule as observed at Sedrun is slightly different. Here a player who plays the King the first time that the suit is led is obliged to call for the Jack. If the player who has the Jack has not yet played, he is obliged to play it; if he already played to the trick, he must surrender the Jack and take in exchange a numeral card of that suit played to the trick (even when he himself played one of the other two court cards). If the player who has the King has the Jack himself, he may play both cards to the trick, taking one of the numeral cards played to it in exchange. It seems evident that one is not allowed to use the *Narr* to escape losing the Jack in this way; it is probable that if the player calls for the Jack when it is in the dealer's discard, he does not get it.

The Müller leaflet states another rule, found, in various forms, in Italian games, but not elsewhere. If a player has the trump 21, he may, whenever he is first compelled to play a trump, knock on the table to signal to his partner his possession of the 21. After the 21 has been played, the same signal may be used to indicate possession of the 20, and, after the 20 has been played, to indicate possession of the 19, etc. The leaflet adds that this rule is not observed in all localities, and it does not appear to be practised at Sedrun.

Such a rule is not required at Sedrun, because the general practice there is to permit any amount of conversation during play. A player may give his opponent information about the cards he has in his hand, or instructions or suggestions about what to play; this may be done at any stage of the deal or the play. There is no requirement that the information given be true: a player may make deliberately false statements to mislead his opponents. The only restriction is that every remark be clearly audible and comprehensible to the others: secret signals are not allowed. The players at Sedrun stated that the greatest variation in the manner of play in different parts of the Vorderrheintal is in the amount and type of conversation permitted; some schools allow only limited conversation, or even none at all, but details of the restrictions are not available to me as yet.

Scoring

A game consists of four rounds, not including abandoned deals. At the end of each round, each side scores the difference, positive or negative, between its total of card points and 36; at Sedrun these are not written down, but just remembered. After each round, therefore, the positive score of one side will be exactly balanced by the negative score, of the same absolute value, of the other. The winning side is of course that which has a positive cumulative score at the end of the four rounds.

In Sedrun the game is played only in this four-handed version, although it was reported that a three-handed form is played in Ilanz. The Müller leaflet describes versions for six, three and five players.

Modern six-handed Swiss Tarock

The six players form two fixed partnerships of three each; the members of the two sides sit alternately. Each player receives thirteen cards in the deal; the method of dealing is not stated (it may be in two rounds of four cards each followed by one of five each). The dealer takes no extra cards, and there is therefore no discard. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in *fours*; one side will have two odd cards, which, like the dealer's discard in the four-handed game, are counted as if they were a full set of four, so that there are still 72 points altogether. A game presumably consists of six rounds. All else is as in the four-handed game.

Modern three-handed Swiss Tarock or Troccas

Each of the three players plays for himself. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each of the other two players and twenty-eight to himself, discarding three; the method of dealing is not stated, but is likely to be in two rounds of eight cards each and a final round in which the other two players receive nine cards and the dealer takes the last twelve. At the end of the round, each player counts his points on the cards he has won in tricks. In this game, the cards are counted one by one: each low card counts 1 point, and the counting cards each have their full value. Low cards in the dealer's discard, however, count nothing, and counting cards in the discard count one less than their nominal value. There are thus altogether 127 points. The dealer scores, in game points, the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 43 points; each of the other two players scores the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 42 points. For the rest, all the rules of the four-handed game apply, save of course that there is no conversation and no signalling that one has the highest trump, since there are no partners.

Modern five-handed Swiss Tarock

Each player plays for himself. The game is exactly like the three-handed one, save that the dealer gives fifteen cards to each of the other players and eighteen to himself, discarding three. The method of dealing is not stated; presumably it is in three rounds of five cards each. The dealer scores the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 27 points; each of the other players scores the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 25 points.

The game described in the *Maison académique* of 1659 was probably already known in neighbouring parts of France when that work was compiled; similar forms of Tarot game may well have been played throughout eastern France. It is plain that players in the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland kept in touch with developments in the game as played in France and adapted their mode of play accordingly. The game as now played by the Romansh and German speakers of Graubünden and Wallis, on the other hand, represents a purely Swiss tradition, which seems wholly unaffected by French influence; it has been untouched by the complications of the later forms of the game in France, or, for that matter, in Germany. It has, however, two very recognisably Italian features: the pause after each round of the deal to see if all the players agree to throw in their hands; and the signal used in some circles to indicate possession of the highest trump. Because of the unwavering use, save for the interlude with the French-suited animal Tarot, of a pack with French inscriptions on the trumps and court cards, it may be presumed that the German-speaking cantons originally imported the game from the French-speaking part of the country. But it is quite likely that it arrived in Switzerland in the first place direct from Italy, rather than through France: the two Italian features just mentioned, at least the first of which was already common in Italian card games in the sixteenth century, may well have already characterised the Swiss game when the *Maison académique* was written, though omitted from the very cursory description of it given in that book.

If the game of Tarot rached Switzerland direct from Italy, the most likely date for it to have done so is in the period when the Swiss were involved with the wars for the control of Milan, up to their defeat by Francis I at Marignano in 1515. If so, it is quite as likely to have been in the French-speaking part of Switzerland as anywhere else that the Tarot de Marseille pattern achieved its definitive form, possibly by the end of the sixteenth century; it is at least suggestive that the *Maison académique* should have regarded the Tarot de Marseille nomenclature and numbering (save for the reversal of the Emperor and Empress) as characteristically Swiss. We have too few clues to decide this with any assurance; but we may conjecture, with greater confidence, that the Tarot de Besançon was a Swiss invention. The invention must have occurred at some time in the hundred years before the date, *c.*1680, of the earliest surviving pack. Tarot de Besançon packs were produced in many widely separated towns of Germany during the eighteenth century, as well as in Switzerland and, presumably in large part for export, in Strasbourg. The pattern may have been a German invention rather than a Swiss one: but there is at least a strong chance that the Swiss were responsible both for the most celebrated of Tarot patterns and for its principal offshoot.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Classic Eighteenth-century Tarot Outside Italy

Two games, a three-handed and a four-handed one, are to be regarded as the fundamental forms of the game of Tarot. In both, the full 78-card pack is used; in both, the Fool serves as Excuse, each honour counts 5 points, each Queen 4, each Cavalier 3 and each Jack 2, the honours being the four Kings, the XXI, the I and the Fool. In neither game are there any bids, declarations or special bonuses: the only way of scoring points is on cards won in tricks. In the three-handed form, each plays for himself in each round; the dealer receives twenty-eight cards in the deal and discards three, the others receive twenty-five cards. The dealer's discard counts for him at the end of the round, and he may not discard honours. The cards are counted in threes, so that there are 78 points altogether. In the four-handed game, the players form two fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. The dealer receives twenty-one cards and discards two, the others receive nineteen each. The discarded cards may not include honours, and count for the dealer's side at the end of the round. The cards are counted in sets of four, the two discarded cards being treated as a complete set, so that there are 72 points altogether.

Of these two fundamental forms of Tarot, we can recognise the modern Swiss four-handed game as diverging from the fundamental four-handed one only in a few respects, such as the rule allowing one who plays a King to the first trick in its suit to demand the Jack; and we can recognise the seventeenth-century Swiss game as being essentially the fundamental three-handed form, save that the Fool was valued at only 3 points (and possibly also that the Jacks were treated as low cards). We shall meet repeatedly with other games that diverge only slightly from one or other of these two fundamental forms. They are fundamental to the entire evolution of Tarot outside Italy, with the sole exception of the French games described in the *Maison académique*: every Tarot game developed anywhere but in Italy from the eighteenth century onwards may be seen as constructed on one or other of the two fundamental forms as a basis (unless it be true that Belgian players continued the tradition of the *Maison académique* games). Since the Bolognese and Sicilian forms of Tarocchi, and the game of Minchiate, cannot be viewed in this way, there is good reason to regard all Tarot games played outside Italy, save those we have conjectured to have been played before 1700 in Paris and Normandy, as stemming from a single source, namely the tradition of play established at some early date in eastern France and its immediate neighbours, including the French-speaking part of Switzerland. Very often, indeed, the further developments were extremely far-reaching, and involved not merely additions to, but radical modifications of, the fundamental games. Nevertheless, the history of Tarot, from the eighteenth century to the present day, can be understood only by taking the two fundamental forms to be the starting-point.

The hundred years between about 1730 and 1830 were the heyday of the game of Tarot; it was played not only in northern Italy, eastern France, Switzerland, Germany and Austro-Hungary, but also in Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and even Russia. Not only was it, in these areas, a famous game with many devotees: it was also, during that period, more truly an international game than it had ever been before or than it has ever been since. At no stage in its history has it ever been an international game in the sense that Bridge and chess are international games, namely that there are international competitions and internationally agreed rules; it has always been one played at home or in the local tavern, coffeehouse or club, and therefore constantly liable to develop local variations. But international games in this sense are a fairly modern phenomenon, and it is rare for card games to achieve that status. During the century that begins in about 1730, however, there was less variation in the manner of playing Tarot with the 78-card pack from one country to another than at any other time. The game assumed more or less the same general form wherever it was played, with countless small local variations in the exact rules or method of scoring, but little deviation in the broad principles of play from one country to another.

The substitution, in some areas, of the French-suited for the Italian-suited Tarot pack made no difference whatever in the manner of playing the game, any more than it made a difference to the game of Ombre whether it was played with a Spanish-suited or French-suited pack. The type of Italian-suited pack used in Germany and Central Europe, namely one deriving from the Tarot de Marseille and with inscriptions in French, provides one reason for regarding the game of Tarot as having travelled there via French-speaking lands and not, say, direct from Italy; a second reason is the conclusion argued for above, that virtually all non-Italian games have a common source. Just when the game reached Germany is problematic. The affirmation of its great popularity there by the *Maison académique* of 1659 sets an upper bound. Detlef Hoffmann has argued that it must have been known there as early as 1557, on the ground that Catelin Geoffroy's Tarot pack of that year, using as it does the non-standard suit-signs introduced by Virgil Solis of Nuremberg, must have been intended for export to Germany. The argument is not conclusive. Non-standard suit-signs were not unknown in France, though this is the only recorded instance of their use, either in France or Germany, in a Tarot pack. Moreover, although D'Allemagne indeed states that Geoffroy was principally concerned with making cards for export, 'export' would include sending cards to Lorraine, and D'Allemagne also remarks that in the sixteenth century Lorraine obtained playing cards chiefly from Lyons;[1] the reference by Duke Charles III to playing cards made under the name of Catelin Geoffroy has already been quoted. There is, however, further support for a sixteenth-century date in the statement of Ivan Honl, unfortunately without a precise reference, that Tarot cards were first mentioned in Bohemia in 1586.[2] Nevertheless, a weighty argument tells against a date earlier than 1600. This is the fact that Fischart, the German translator of Rabelais, very greatly extended Rabelais's list of the games played by Gargantua, but omitted from it the game of Tarot, which Rabelais had included. Fischart was born in 1546 or 1547 in Strasbourg; he died at the end of the year 1590. The first edition of his version of Rabelais came out, under the title *Geschichtklitterung*, in 1575, the second in 1582, and the third, expanded, one, in which the list of games was yet further enlarged, in the year of his death, 1590.[3] Fischart must have gone to immense pains to discover the names of as many games as possible to include in his list: his omission of a game that appeared in Rabelais's list is powerful evidence that it was not played in Alsace during his lifetime. This is particularly strong evidence, in view of the fact that Alsace is the obvious route for the game of Tarot to have taken from France to Germany.

Were it not for Honl's Bohemian reference in 1586, the obvious conclusion would be that Tarot did not reach Germany until around 1600; but we can accept such a conclusion only by dismissing Honl's reference as spurious. There is, however, one possibility of reconciling the conflicting evidence, namely by supposing that the game first reached Germany, not from France, but from Switzerland. Even so, it is surprising that it should have reached Bohemia before Alsace; we shall therefore do well to leave that precise route and date of its arrival in Germany an as yet unresolved mystery.

[1] Both remarks are to be found in H.-R. D'Allemagne, *Les Cartes à jouer*, Paris, 1906, vol. II, p. 212.

[2] Ivan Honl, *Z Minulosti karetní hry v Čechách*, Prague, 1947, p. 31.

[3] A modern reprint of the third edition of the *Geschichtklitterung* of Johann der Täufer Friedrich Fischart was published in Düsseldorf in 1963, edited by Ute Nyssen. The chapter on games is chap. 25, pp. 238-51 in the 1963 edition, the list of games being on pp. 239-49.

However the mystery is to be resolved, the game must have become well established in southern Germany in the early seventeenth century; and, even if it did not originally enter from France via Alsace, direct French influence must have made itself felt at an early stage. By the eighteenth century, Tarot de Besançon packs were being made not only in Kempten, Augsburg and Mannheim, but also in Alsace, in Strasbourg and Colmar. The most striking evidence of French influence is the French terminology used by German Tarot players. We have seen that in the *Maison académique* the mode of playing the *Fou* was expressed by saying that '*le Fou sert d'excuse*'. In the eighteenth century French Tarot players began calling the Fool *l'Excuse*, as they do to this day. In German-speaking countries this name was corrupted to *der Schkis, der Skys, der Scüs*, etc., the form now in general use in Austria being *der Sküs*; and the derivation must be from the French word rather than from Italian *scusa*, which was not in the same way used as the name of the card. Likewise, we have already seen that the XXI is regularly known by German-speaking Tarot players as *der Mond*, or, in earlier times, occasionally as *der Mongue* or *der Mongur*, corruptions of French *le Monde*. This could, indeed, equally well be thought to be derived from Italian *il Mondo*, while the term *sans prendre* could be taken from French Ombre players, and the term *à trois* instead of *zu dritt* for a three-handed game regarded as a part of a general Frenchified card player's vocabulary. But we can only see the term *Kavallerie*, for a set of court cards in one suit, as an adaptation of the French *chevalerie*, especially as there was no cognate term in Italian, and can only take as based on a French original the practice of saying '*avec*' (with) or '*sans*' (without) to indicate whether or not the trump I was included in a declaration of ten trumps. The most striking example is the term *Trull* or *Troule*, a corruption of French *tous les trois*, used in both Austria and Germany, for the set of all three Tarot honours (the XXI, the I and the Fool).

Almost the earliest account in the German language of any form of Tarot game is that given in a book entitled *Die Kunst, die Welt erlaubt mitzunehmen in den verschiedenen Arten der Spiele* (*KW*), published in Vienna and Nuremberg in 1756; and the second edition, of 1769, contains the earliest account of a game specifically said to be played in Austria. This game is said to be the newest form of four-handed Taroc played in Vienna, and employs the Italian terms *reale* and *doppio*. It proves in fact to be precisely the type of four-handed game played in Lombardy, which was then one of the Austrian dominions, a game very close to the fundamental four-handed form described at the beginning of this chapter. We should therefore certainly see this game as an importation from Lombardy; but that in no way takes us outside the circle of the 'international' form of Tarot that flourished during that period, because, as we have seen, the games played with the 78-card pack in Lombardy and also in Piedmont during the eighteenth century had probably themselves been imported from France. Despite the vogue in Vienna for a Milanese form of Tarot, the game of Tarot in general must have been known in Vienna before the Austrian acquisition of Milan in 1713, at least if it was known in Bohemia by 1586; and, in any case, the influence of the German form of the game soon proved greater than any influences from Italy, and, at least in the second half of our 'international' century, Tarot as played in Germany and in Austria are not to be distinguished from one another. In the very book already referred to, *KW*, there is also described a game of the characteristic classic international eighteenth-century type. The mutual influence was certainly very much assisted by the shared language: *KW* was only the first of many card-game books in German to be published simultaneously in Vienna and in some German city, books which must have helped to introduce players to new modes of play which had originated elsewhere and to maintain a common tradition in German-speaking lands.

Before describing the developments that went to form the classic international type of Tarot game, it is best to set out the straightforward four-handed Viennese game imported from Lombardy, a game included in other German card-game books up to the early nineteenth century, and in Dutch ones up to 1836. From the eighteenth century on, despite the great variety of games played, the values of the counting cards are, except in Italy, almost always the same, namely those given for the fundamental games described at the beginning of the chapter: 5 points each for the XXI, the I and the Fool; 5 points for each King; 4 points for each Queen; 3 points for each Cavalier; and 2 points for each

Jack. The method of counting points – whether in twos, threes or fours, or in some other way – varies considerably; but the actual values are almost always constant (with, as it happens, one exception in the game about to be described). It will therefore save space henceforth, when, describing non-Italian games, to refer to these values as '*standard*', noting any divergences. In describing Italian games, however, the values will still be stated explicitly, because there is great variation.

Viennese four-handed Taroc (mid-eighteenth century)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Tarocs*; the XXI is called the *Mongue*, the I the *Pagat* and the Fool the *Scüs*. The suits are referred to by their Italian names, the discard is called *der Scar* and a slam is called *Volata*.

Play

The four players form two fixed partnerships, the partners facing each other across the table. The full 78-card Italian-suited pack is used; the cards rank in their original order. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player, and takes the last two for himself. It is not stated how the cards are to be dealt. The last card dealt to each player is turned face up by the dealer; he himself turns face up the extra two cards that he is to take, and, if either of them is a trump or a King, he continues to turn his cards face up, beginning with those last dealt, until two cards neither of which is a trump or a King are visible. (Presumably the Scüs counts for this purpose as a trump, though this is not stated.) Then all pick up their hands, and the dealer discards two cards, which may not be Kings or trumps, but, if counting cards, count for his side at the end of the round. The counting cards have their standard values, save that the XXI (Mongue) counts 6 points. The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick, the direction of play being counter-clockwise, and the hands are played out under the usual rules of play; the Scüs serves as Excuse. If the opponents of the player who has the Scüs win the trick to which it is played, they receive a card in exchange for it. (By analogy with the Lombard game, they do so either immediately or as soon as possible, and the Scüs is surrendered if the side who played it win no tricks, but this is not stated.) At the end of the round, the cards are counted in fours; the two cards of the dealer's discard count nothing if both are low cards, and one less than the value of each counting card otherwise. There are thus altogether 72 points. The winning side scores the difference between its point-total and 36 points. A game (*Partie*) consists of four rounds. The winning side is that which has the higher cumulative point-total; they score 1 game point for the win, plus one more (for *Doppio*) if the opponents have scored no points (i.e. have not won a round); the winners also receive a bonus of 1 game point (for *Reale*) if they have scored 36 or more points more than the losers. The bonus to be paid when, in any round, one side gives *Volata* to the other, i.e. wins all the tricks, is to be settled by agreement; but, if a side wins all the tricks in one round, but fails to win the game as a whole, neither side pays the other. Usually six games are played, two each with each possible selection of partners; but sometimes the same partners play together for all six games, this being called a *partita ferma*.

Probably quite early in the eighteenth century, Tarot players in France and Germany introduced two new complications into the fundamental three- and four-handed games. These two new features were already well established by 1755, on the testimony of the *Palamedes Redivivus (PR)* published in Leipzig in that year; and, to judge by the French vocabulary of that and other early German accounts, it was in France that these new ideas originated. The first new feature was that of bonus scores for declarations or melds, before play, of particular combinations of cards in the hand of a single player. This was not, indeed, a wholly new idea; not only was it well known in other games, but it had characterised certain Italian forms of Tarocco from as early as the sixteenth century. But, as we shall see, the typical Italian rule was that one scored *both* for having these special combinations in one's hand before play began, and for having them among the cards one had won in tricks at the end of play; and in four-handed games with partners, these bonuses tended to swamp the points won on individual cards. In the classic games played outside Italy, on the other hand, the bonuses applied only to combinations of cards held in hand before play. Moreover, the combinations recognised were different. It is thus probable that the introduction of this feature into 'international' eighteenth-century Tarot did not result from the imitation of any Italian prototype, but from the independent application to the game of Tarot of an idea generally familiar in card play.

The bonuses for such declarations were an extraneous feature superimposed upon the basic game: the payments for them were made immediately, but a player who had made such a declaration did not usually gain points which counted towards the winning of the round, which was determined in the ordinary way solely by the number of points each player had on the cards he had won in tricks. The most usual combinations of cards that could be declared were: ten or more trumps; all three of the trump XXI, trump I and the Fool; all four Kings; and a *Chevalerie*, that is, a set of all four court cards in one suit. This was very often complicated by the use of the Fool as a wild card for purposes of declarations: it could substitute for any one missing card in a declaration, save, of course, that of the XXI, I and Fool, in which it figured in its own right. Usually however, it was held that a declaration made only by treating the Fool as a substitute for a missing card was worth less than one entirely made up of genuine cards. A further complication arose from an imitation of the idea of 'Matadors' from Ombre. In Ombre the Matadors consisted of an unbroken sequence of trumps from the top trump down held in the hand of a single player. In Germany, however, this idea was, in Tarock, grafted on to the declaration of 'all three' of the XXI, the I and the Fool. These three cards were called the principal Matadors; but, if a player was lucky enough, he could add to a declaration of three Matadors any further trumps in unbroken sequence from the XX down, thus increasing his bonus for the declaration.

The second new feature was that of a bonus for a particular feat effected in play, or a penalty for a particular misfortune suffered in play. Originally, such bonuses and penalties related only to the trump I or Pagat; the word *Pagat* is, of course, a corruption of *Bagatto*, and since it, or some very similar word, was almost universally used for the trump I, we shall henceforth refer to that card as the Pagat save in connection with Italian games. Indeed, it seems probable that the idea of a penalty antedated that of a bonus. If, in the three-handed game, the Pagat was beaten by a higher trump in the trick to which it was played, and so lost, the player who had the Pagat had to pay a penalty of 5 game points to each of the other players. It should be noted that this can be construed only as a penalty for losing the Pagat, not as a bonus for capturing it. If it had been a bonus for capturing the Pagat, then we should have expected only the player who captured it to be paid, perhaps by each of the other players, or perhaps by the one who lost it alone. The rule was, however, that the player who lost it paid *both* the one who captured it, and the third player. If the Pagat was lost in the last trick, the penalty was doubled. If there was a stage at which only these penalties existed, without any corresponding bonus, we have no record of it. If there was such a stage, it must quickly have come to seem unsatisfactory to make possession of the Pagat so dangerous, without the chance of a compensatory reward; and hence the rule was introduced which we actually find in the accounts, namely that, if the last trick was won by the Pagat, the player received a bonus payment of 10 game points from each of the other two. It is quite likely, however, that there was a preliminary stage in which only the penalties, and not the bonus, existed, since, in the earliest accounts, we find no bonus for winning any trick before the last one with the Pagat. Later, the rule was made symmetrical, so that a player who brought the Pagat home by winning a trick other than the last one with it was paid by each of the other two players a bonus of 5 game points. Like the bonuses for declarations, these bonuses and penalties were superimposed upon the basic game: except, of course, in so far as the actual possession of the Pagat, as a counting card, was concerned, they did not affect the determination, at the end of the round, of who had won the round and by how much, which still depended solely on the cards won in tricks. A subsequent development was to extend the same principle to the four Kings, with bonuses of 5 game points for bringing them home and corresponding penalties for losing them, again doubled if it happened in the last trick. Usually, when this was done, the bonus for winning the last trick with the Pagat was increased to 15 game points, as being harder to achieve than to win the last trick with a King.

Thus was conceived what was to become of the most characteristic and interesting features of many of the later varieties of Tarot, the bonus for Pagat ultimo, that is, for winning the last trick with the Pagat; this survived, and developed into one of the most important elements of many forms of the game, long after special bonuses and penalties for bringing home or losing the Pagat, or a King, in tricks earlier than the last, had been dropped. It was certainly not in Italy that this important invention occurred, but either in

Germany or, with slightly less probability, in France. We do indeed find the idea in some of the games played in Piedmont, though not in those played in Lombardy, in the eighteenth century, and this may explain the use in Austria of the Italian term *ultimo*; but, as already remarked, the games played in northern Italy from the eighteenth century on were not of Italian origin. The idea of the Bagatto ultimo is wholly absent from those Tarot games played in Italy which we know to be free of foreign influence, that is, in the Bolognese and Sicilian forms of the game and in Minchiate; and there is no hint of it in any of the early Italian references to Tarocco.

The bonuses and penalties relating to the Pagat were originally developed for the three-handed game. There was a problem in transferring them to the four-handed game with partners, for two reasons. One question that arose was what was to happen when the trick to which the Pagat was played was won by the partner of the player who had the Pagat. Should that side be awarded a bonus, since they had after all saved their Pagat from capture? Or should they pay a penalty, because the Pagat had been beaten by a higher trump? No one felt that such an easy feat, which could, after all, be effected by leading the XXI towards one's partner, merited a bonus. But it was generally regarded as unfair to penalise that side; and so such an event normally carried with it neither a bonus nor a penalty. In later games, however, the stricter interpretation has sometimes been adopted. The second question was who deserved the bonus or incurred the penalty: only the individual player, or his partner as well? Here the principle of collective responsibility prevailed: the partner has assisted or hindered his colleague by his play, and must be rewarded or penalised along with him. Thus, in the four-handed game, if a player won a trick with the Pagat, he was paid 5 game points by one of the opponents, or 10 if it was the last trick, and his partner was paid the same by the other opponent; and, if the Pagat was captured by the opponents, the player who lost the Pagat paid 5 game points to one opponent, or 10 if it happened in the last trick, and his partner paid the same to the other opponent.

In Germany a third new feature was introduced, a restriction on when the Fool, Excuse or Scüs could be played. This usually took the form of a prohibition on playing it to any of the last three tricks; in later forms, this was varied to a deprivation of the Scüs's immunity from capture in the last three tricks, so that a player might legally play it to one of those tricks, but then lost it. This change was imitated, in a muted manner, namely as applying only to the last trick, in some French forms of Tarot, including that now played, but did not have any very general importance for the future development of the game

From the mid-eighteenth century onwards, Germany was prolific of card-game books. The two earliest accounts of classic eighteenth-century Tarock known to me are from the two books already mentioned, the first edition of *KW* (1756) and the 1755 edition of *PR*. To these may be added one in *L'Hombre Royal* (*HR*), a volume published in Vienna and Prague in 1824, since, although it is so very much later, the description of Tarock that it contains must, save for one footnote, have been copied from some much earlier original. These three accounts, though differently worded, describe exactly the same three-handed game; but one can still detect some historical development. The *KW* text consists of a general description followed by a set of numbered rules, and there is a little inconsistency between these, notably over the payment for a Cavallerie. It is therefore probable that the first half is a reprint of some earlier description to which a more up-to-date set of rules has been appended, without eliminating the contradictions; in the account that follows, I shall accordingly indicate this by means of the terms 'earlier stratum' and 'later stratum'. The *HR* account appears to be more archaic than either of the other two. The use of French terminology, particularly, in *PR*, of the term *Excuse* for the Fool, makes it very likely that an identical or similar game was played in France. It cannot be told from the *PR* text whether the game was to be played with an Italian- or French-suited pack, but *KW* and *HR* specify a French-suited one, *KW* mentioning the animal figures on the trump cards. *KW* refers to the Italian-suited pack, but says that it is mostly used for a four-handed game, going on (in the second edition) to explain the Lombard/Viennese game described above. It also says that the game of Taroc had only recently been introduced into Germany, a statement we know to be erroneous; it presumably testifies to the spread of the game to some new area.

German Taroc (mid-eighteenth century)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Tarocs* (*PR* and *KW*) or *Taroks* (*HR*). The XXI is called *der Mongue* (*KW* and *HR*), *der Mond* (*HR*) or simply no. 21 (*PR*); the I is called *der Pagat* (all three), *der Bagat* (*PR*) or *der Pacat* (*KW*); the Fool is called *der Excuse* (*PR*), *der Sckis* (*PR* and *KW*), *der Schkis* (*KW*), *der Skis* (*KW*) or *der Scüs* (*HR*). The discard is called *der Skar* (*KW*).

Deal and discard

There are three players. A full 78-card French-suited pack is used. Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in five rounds of five cards each, beginning with the player on his right, and taking in addition the last three cards for himself in the last round. He discards three cards face down beside him, which count for him at the end of the round. He may not discard Kings. If he has exactly three trumps including the Pagat, he may, if he wishes, discard all three of them; if he has the Skis, the Pagat and exactly one other trump, he may, if he wishes, discard these three cards. In no other circumstances may he discard a trump. *HR* states that some players allow that the deal is to be cancelled, and the cards redealt by the same dealer, if any player has only one or two trumps; but *PR* and *KW* do not mention this rule. Note that there is no general prohibition on discarding the Skis.

Declarations

After the dealer has discarded, he makes any declarations he chooses of combinations of cards in his hand; the other two players then do the same in turn. The dealer cannot declare any cards he has discarded; according to *PR* and *KW*, all declared cards must be shown to the other two players (*HR* is silent on this point). No player is obliged to make any declaration even if he is able to. The possible declarations are:

(i) Matadors. *HR* and the earlier stratum of *KW* allow the declaration only of three of these, which must consist of the Mongue (XXI), Pagat and Skis. *KW* gives a value of 10 game points for this, but *HR* says that some players value it at 10 and some at 20 game points, agreement being necessary before sitting down to the game. *PR* and the later stratum of *KW* allow a declaration of three or more Matadors, consisting of the Mongue, Pagat and Skis and, in addition, other trumps in consecutive sequence from the XX down, with a value of 10 game points plus 5 more for each Matador in excess of three.

(ii) Cavallerie. This consists of all four court cards in one suit, and is valued at 4 game points by *HR* and the earlier stratum of *KW*, and at 10 game points by *PR* and the later stratum of *KW*. *PR* and the later stratum of *KW* also allow the declaration of a half Cavallerie, consisting of any three court cards of one suit together with the Skis, with a value of 5 game points; a whole Cavallerie and a half Cavallerie cannot be declared in the same suit. *HR* and the earlier stratum of *KW* do not recognise half Cavallerie declarations.

(iii) Ten trumps. *HR* says that this declaration is recognised in many localities, and that the players must agree on the value to be set on it. *KW* allows the declaration unreservedly, with a value of 10 game points, which, however, are not to be paid immediately, but only at the end of the round, and then only if the player concerned has made more than 26 points on the cards he has won in tricks. *PR* allows a declaration of ten or more trumps, with a value of 10 game points plus 5 game points for each trump in excess of ten; this is paid immediately, with no proviso about points won on cards. In no case does the Skis count for this purpose as a trump.

(iv) *PR*, but not *KW* or *HR*, allows a declaration of all four Kings, valued at 10 game points; alternatively, one may declare three Kings with the Skis, with a value of 5 game points. One may not, of course, make both these declarations.

The payment for any declaration is made immediately by the other two players, who each pay its full value, save in the case of a declaration of ten trumps under the *KW* rule.

Play

When all three players have had a chance to make declarations, the player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. Play is under the usual rules. The cards rank in their original order (i.e. in black suits K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, A, in red suits K, Q, C, J, A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). The Skis serves as Excuse. The player takes it back from the trick to which he played it, and, if he can, gives a low card in exchange for it; otherwise he does so as soon as he can. If he makes no tricks, however, he does *not* surrender it. If a player has no more trumps in his hand, then, according to *PR* and *KW*, he must play the Skis, if he has it, as soon as a plain suit is led in which he is void; *HR* does not impose this obligation. The Skis may not be played to any of the last three tricks. *PR* and *KW* do not allow the Skis to be led to a trick; if a player finds himself with the lead to the twenty-second trick, and has the Skis, he must surrender the lead to the player on his right, and must play the Skis to that trick. According to *HR*, however, custom varies over whether the Skis may be led to a trick, and, again, agreement over this must be reached before playing: when the Skis is led to a trick, among those who allow this, the other two players must play trumps if they can. It is not explained what happens if neither of them has any trumps left; presumably the player who led the Skis wins the trick.

Bonuses and penalties

Apart from a passing reference to Pagat ultimo in a sentence that appears to have been borrowed from *KW* in a misplaced attempt to bring the antiquated account that was being copied up to date, *HR* mentions only penalties: the player who has the Pagat pays an agreed sum to each opponent if it is captured, and twice that sum to each if it is captured in the last trick. According to *PR* and *KW*, 5 game points are paid to each opponent if the Pagat is beaten by a higher trump, and 10 game points if this happens in the last trick; but a player who wins the last trick with the Pagat is paid 10 game points by each opponent.

Scoring

The counting cards have their standard values. The cards are counted in threes. If the player who had the Skis made no tricks, he counts 4 points for his Skis, while the player who won the trick to which he played it counts his two odd cards as if they were three. There are thus in all cases 78 points altogether. Each player with fewer than 26 points pays, in all, as many game points as he has card points short of 26; each player with more than 26 points receives, in all, as many game points as he has card points in excess of 26. (E.g. if A has 29 card points, B 24 and C 25, B pays A 2 game points and C pays him 1 game point; if A has 29 points, B 30 and C 19, C pays 3 game points to A and 4 game points to B.)

From France itself we have only one eighteenth-century account of Tarot, and that from an unexpected source, de Gébelin's *Le Monde primitif*, dating from 1781; together with his speculations on the Egyptian origin and esoteric significance of the cards, recounted in Chapter 4, he included a description of the game. He did not know the game himself, but retails an account given to him by his friend Monsieur L'A. R. We therefore cannot be certain that de Gébelin succeded in transmitting all the details correctly. The game he describes is a two-handed one, which can hardly have been the principal form; but the fact that in modern French Tarot the cards are counted in twos probably indicates that at some stage a two-handed version was regarded as important and in some way typical. De Gébelin's two-handed game is played with a *mort*, a dead hand of twenty-five cards. It is therefore obvious that it has been rather mechanically adapted from a three-handed game, which it is easy to reconstruct with a high degree of probability.

Two-handed eighteenth-century French Tarot (after de Gébelin)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Atous*, the XXI *le Monde*, the I *le Pagad* and the Fool *le Mat* or *le Fou*. These last three cards are called collectively *Atous-Tarots*, and they together with the four Kings are known as *Tarots*. The five top trumps (XVII to XXI) are called *grands Atous* and the five lowest trumps (I to V) *petits Atous*. The pack used is a 78-card Italian-suited one.

Deal and discard

The dealer gives out three hands of twenty-five cards each, in five rounds of five cards each, one hand to his opponent, one to form the *mort* (dead hand), which is not touched until the end of the round, and one to himself. In the last round of the deal, he takes the last three cards for himself, and discards three, which count to him at the end of the round. He may not discard Kings, the Fou or trumps.

Declarations

Each player in turn may make any of the following declarations:

All three *Atous-Tarots* (Monde, Pagad and Fou) – 15 points
Ten trumps – 10 points
Thirteen trumps – 15 points
All four court cards of one suit – 5 points
All five top trumps – 15 points
All five lowest trumps – 15 points
Any four of the five top trumps – 10 points
Any four of the five lowest trumps – 10 points
Any three of the five top trumps – 5 points
Any three of the five lowest trumps – 5 points.

If a player has just two of the three *Atous-Tarots*, he asks his opponent, '*Qui ne l'a?*': if the opponent has the third *Atou-Tarot*, he shows it, and neither of them scores; but, if the opponent cannot show the third one, the player holding two scores 5 points. A player declaring ten or thirteen trumps must show that many to his opponent; for the other declarations, the cards need not be shown. The probability is that, for a declaration of ten or thirteen trumps, the Fou counts as a trump, but this is not made explicit. The declarations take place before play begins, but it is not said which player declares first.

Play

The hands are played out under the usual rules. Almost certainly, the cards rank in each suit K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, A, though this is not stated. The Fou serves as Excuse; probably a card must be given in exchange for it, though this is not stated.

Bonuses

For capturing the opponent's Pagad – 5 points
For capturing a King from the opponent – 5 points
For having two Kings and the Fou in one's tricks – 5 points
For having three Kings and the Fou in one's tricks – 15 points.

These last two bonuses look rather odd. At the very least one would expect that there should as well be a bonus of 5 points for having three Kings without the Fou, and of 15 points for having all four Kings. De Gébelin's actual words are merely, 'Le Fou avec deux Rois, compte 5 points: avec trois, quinze' (the Fou with two Kings counts 5 points; with three, fifteen), which one would take to describe a declaration were it not that it occurred, not in that section, but in that headed 'Manner of playing one's cards'. It is possible, therefore, that de Gébelin has mistaken a declaration for a bonus; if so, it is even more probable that scores for three or all four genuine Kings should be added.

Scoring

At the end of the round, each player reckons up his points on the cards he has won in tricks, counting in twos and assigning the standard values to the counting cards; the dealer will have one odd card, which counts nothing if it is low, and one less than its value if it is a counting card. Each player adds to his total the number of points for bonuses and declarations; the one with the higher grand total scores the difference between his total and his opponent's. The game ends in that round in which one or both players reach a cumulative total of 100 points, and is won by the player who has the highest score at the end of that round.

There are one or two uncertainties in de Gébelin's account, and a possible mistake is noted above; but on the whole he has been very careful, and we should take his description as in the main authentic. It is evidence of his accuracy that in modern French Tarot there are distinct melds of ten and of thirteen trumps, a feature not exactly paralleled in any game played elsewhere. It is surprising that the bonus for capturing the Pagad or a King is not increased when this happens in the last trick; but we do not have the evidence to stigmatise this as a mistake on de Gébelin's part. A very similar two-handed game, but with different declarations and bonuses, also played to 100 up, was common in Germany, and will be described later.

The following is a conjectural reconstruction of the three-handed game.

Three-handed eighteenth-century French Tarot (reconstructed)

All is as in the preceding two-handed game, with the following exceptions. Each of the three players receives twenty-five cards in the deal, the dealer taking the last three cards and discarding three, which count for him. If a player has any two of the Monde, Pagad and Fou, then, at his turn for making declarations, he may ask, '*Qui ne l'a?*'. The player holding the third card says so, and the player holding two of them is then paid 5 game points by the remaining player alone. Otherwise, each declaration is rewarded, in game points, by each of the other two players. A player losing the Pagad or a King pays 5 game points to each opponent. A player having all four Kings, or three Kings and the Fou, among the cards he has won in tricks is paid 15 game points by each opponent at the end of the round; a player having three Kings, or two Kings and the Fou, is paid 5 game points by each. The cards won in tricks are counted in threes; each player who has more than 26 card points is paid, in all, as many game points as he has card points over 26, and each who has less than 26 card points pays, in all, as many game points as he has card points below 26. A game consists of three rounds.

A booklet published in Amsterdam in 1846, *Beknopte Handleiding tot het Tarok-Spel*, gives a version of classic three-handed Tarot as played in the Netherlands. That development of it which we shall describe in the next chapter under the name Grosstarock was already known in the Netherlands in 1821, so that the 1846 booklet was probably describing an old-fashioned form; since accounts of card games are reprinted over and over again, without warning or acknowledgment, from one book to another, it is never safe to assume that a game was being played in the manner in which it is described at the date when a description was published, unless one has reasonable grounds for believing that that was the first appearance of that particular text. The terminology used in the present booklet is markedly French, which may indicate that the game described was originally played in France or Belgium; its true epoch may have been around 1800.

Three-handed Dutch Tarok (1846 text)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Taroks*; the I is called *Pagato* and the Fool is called the *Excuse*. A set of all four court cards of one suit is called a *chevalerie*.

Deal and discard

There are three players. A 78-card French-suited pack is used. Deal and play are *clockwise*. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in seven rounds of three each, followed by a round of four each, beginning with the player on his left; in the last round of the deal, he takes the last three cards himself. He discards three cards, which count to him at the end of the round. No restriction is stated on the cards he may discard; probably this is an oversight, and he may not discard Kings or trumps.

Declarations

After the dealer has discarded, the declarations are made in turn; it is not stated which player has the first chance to declare. The possible declarations are:

Ten trumps – 5 game points
Nine trumps with the Excuse – 5 game points
All four Kings – 5 game points
All four Kings with the Excuse – 10 game points
Three Kings with the Excuse – 5 game points
Chevalerie entière (all four court cards of one suit) – 5 game points
Chevalerie entière par Excuse (all four court cards of one suit with the Excuse) – 10 game points
Chevalerie par Excuse (the King and two other court cards of one suit with the Excuse) – 5 game points
Matadors (the XXI, the Pagato and the Excuse) – 5 game points.

The Excuse may be used in only *one* declaration. Note that there is no additional bonus for having more than ten trumps, and no obligation to reveal whether one has more than ten. The cards declared must be shown to the other players. Each opponent pays a player making a declaration immediately; but if one who has declared ten trumps or nine trumps with the Excuse fails to make 26 points on the cards he wins in tricks, he must pay back the bonus to each opponent. It is a little obscure whether there is in fact a declaration of Matadors (of which one may not, in any case, declare more than three), since an erratum to the section on declarations, printed at the end of the booklet and designed to correct the omission of the values of the XXI, the Pagato and the Excuse as counting cards, contrives to suppress the Matadors declaration; but this is almost certainly an error.

Play

When the declarations are completed, play begins; presumably the player to the left of the dealer leads to the first trick. The rules of play are as usual, save that, when a suit is led, and the third player is void in that suit, he is not obliged to play a trump if the second player has played one. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order. The Excuse of course serves as Excuse, and, when it is played to a trick and taken back, another card is immediately given in exchange from those already won. Apparently the player who holds the Excuse is not allowed to play it until he has won a trick; nor, it seems, can it be led to a trick (except, perforce, the last one). However, if the Excuse is played to either of the *two* last tricks, it may no longer be taken back, but is lost to the winner of the trick.

Bonuses and penalties

A player from whom the Pagato or a King is captured pays a penalty of 5 game points to each opponent; if the Pagato is lost in the last trick, he pays 10 game points. If a player wins the last trick with the Pagato, each of the other two players pays him a bonus of 10 game points. If a player wins the last two tricks with the XXI and the Pagato, in either order, each of the other two pays him a bonus of 20 game points. The last trick has no special significance for a King.

Scoring

At the end of the round, each player reckons up his points on the cards he has won in tricks. He counts 1 point for each trick he has won, including 1 point for the three discarded cards, and adds in the values of his counting cards, according to the schedule:

The XXI	4 points
The Pagato	4 points
The Excuse	4 points
Each King	4 points
Each Queen	3 points
Each Chevalier	2 points
Each Jack	1 point

This is, of course, equivalent to using the standard method and counting the cards in threes, and yields a total of 78 points altogether. As between each pair of players, the one with the lower point-total pays the other as many game points as his own point-total falls short of the other's; in this way, each player with a point-total of more than 26 receives, in all, three times as many game points as he has card points in excess of 26, and conversely for one with a point-total below 26.

The classic three-handed game was adapted in Germany for play by two people in a manner very similar to the two-handed game described by de Gébelin; so similar, indeed, that they must have had a common origin. The two-handed game was clearly quite popular, and is set out in very many German card-game books throughout the nineteenth century, the earliest known to me being the *Neuster Spielalmanach für das Jahr 1800 (NSa)* by Julius Cäsar (which, as the magistrate said when Bertie Wooster appeared before him as Leon Trotsky, I strongly suspect to be an assumed name), published in Berlin, and the latest *Ausgewählte Kartenspiele* by Albert Stabenow, published in Leipzig 1908-10. Very probably the game goes back to at least about 1750. All the descriptions state that the declarations are the same as in the three-handed game. Now, as will be set out in the next chapter, the declarations admitted in the three-handed game varied greatly. Most of the card-game books simply repeat, word for word, the account of the two-handed game given in *NSa* (1800), although the *Neustes Spielbuch* (*NS*) published in Leipzig in 1840 has a fresh description with a different method of scoring. It is difficult to know whether to take the books at their word, and assume that, as the set of declarations admitted in the three-handed game varied, those in the two-handed one varied with them, or whether the rules governing declarations in the two-handed game remained frozen at the stage when the original description of the game was first composed.

Two-handed German Tarok (nineteenth century)

Deal and discard

A 78-card French-suited pack is used. The dealer deals three hands of twenty-five cards, in five rounds of five each, one hand to his opponent, the second a dead hand that is not looked at until the end of the round, the third hand to himself; in the last round of the deal, he takes the last three cards for himself. (This is the original method, although some did not bother with it, merely dealing twenty-five cards to the opponent and twenty-eight to the dealer in rounds of five each, with eight for the dealer on the last round, and setting the remaining twenty-five cards aside.) The dealer discards three cards; he may not discard Kings or trumps.

Declarations

When the dealer has discarded, the two players make, in turn, any declarations which they wish, and are able, to make. The admissible declarations may be taken to be those of the second version (about 1800) of three-handed German Tarok given in the next chapter: in this case, the dealer declares first, and the declared cards are not shown. It is also possible that at an early stage the declarations were those of the mid-eighteenth-century German Taroc described above in this chapter, in which case the dealer declares first, but the declared cards are shown to the opponent. It may further be that the declarations developed parallel to those in the three-handed game, so that some players used those set out in the third version (about 1820) of three-handed Tarok given in the next chapter; in this case the opponent declared first, and the declared cards had to be shown, save, perhaps, in a declaration of ten or more Taroks, for which it was necessary only to state whether or not the Pagat and the Scüs were included. The adoption of these rules for declarations is especially likely when the variant system of scoring, up to 120 game points, was employed.

Play

The opponent leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out under the usual rules. The cards rank in their original order. The Scüs serves as Excuse, and a low card is given in exchange for it as soon as possible; but it is captured by the opponent if it is played to any of the last three tricks (or, according to *NS* (1840), to any of the last five).

Bonuses

Either player scores 10 points for winning a trick containing a (genuine) King, or 15 points if this happens in the last trick. Either scores 15 points for winning a trick containing the Pagat, or 25 points if it is the last trick.

Scoring

The payments for declarations and for bonuses are not made immediately; the points gained for them are merely recorded. At the end of the round, each player reckons up his points on cards won in tricks, counting them in *twos*, with standard values for the counting cards. He adds these points to those he has gained from declarations and bonuses, and keeps a running total from round to round. The game ends with that round in which either player attains 100 points, but the round must be played out, and the winner is the player with the higher score at the end of that round. There is a fixed payment for winning the game, which is doubled if the opponent has less than 50 points; but, in addition, the loser pays, of course at a much lower rate, in proportion to the number of points by which his score was below that of the winner. (One text suggests that the score for winning the game be 25 times the value of a point, but others suggest a much higher ratio.)

According to *NS* (1840), however, the game ends only with that round in which a player attains 120 points. The winner then scores 1 game point if the opponent has a score of 60 points or over, 2 game points if he has scored between 30 and 59 points, 3 game points if he has scored between 1 and 29 points, and 4 game points if he has scored nothing. In this case, there is no additional payment for the difference in points between the winner's and the loser's score.

Classic Tarock was essentially a three-handed game, and adaptations of it for four players were uncommon. Dutch card-game books of 1821 and 1836 give only the Lombard/Viennese game described above, but the booklet of 1846 from which the foregoing account of the Dutch three-handed game was taken gives also a transposition of this to a four-handed form.

Four-handed Dutch Tarok (nineteenth century)

There are four players in fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. Deal and play are clockwise. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each, starting with the player on his left, in five rounds of three cards each and one of four. In the last round of the deal he gives himself the two remaining cards, and then discards two. After the dealer has discarded, each player in turn makes any declarations he can, as in the three-handed game, showing the cards he declares to the other players. One of the opponents pays the player who has made a given declaration, the other pays that player's partner. If any player makes a declaration of ten trumps or of nine trumps with the Excuse, he and his partner must together make 39 points on the cards they win in tricks; if they fail to do so, each must restore the 5 game points he was paid for the declaration. When the declarations are completed, the player to the left of the dealer leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out. Play is under the same rules as for the three-handed game: if a plain suit is led in which a player is void, that player need not play a trump if a trump has already been played to the trick when it is his turn to play. The bonuses and penalties are as in the three-handed game: one member of the side that is to pay pays one of the opponents, and his partner pays the other opponent. At the end of the round, each side counts up the points they have won in tricks. They score 1 point for every three cards, together with the points for scoring cards, on the same schedule as in the three-handed game; one odd low card counts nothing, and two odd low cards count 1 point. There are thus 78 points altogether. Each member of the losing side pays one of the winners as many game points as the losers' point-total falls short of the winners' point-total (or, what is the same, twice as many as the losers' point-total falls short of 39 points). If, however, one side makes all the tricks, this is called *Reale*, and payment is doubled. If the opponents of the dealer win all the tricks, the dealer's discard is surrendered to them: hence the payment for *Reale* is always 156 game points (twice 78).

In Germany, from the later eighteenth century down to the end of the nineteenth, most card-game books which mention four-handed games played with the 78-card pack describe only two forms, the Lombard/Viennese game and Tarok-Quadrille, a four-handed game without fixed partnerships which will be explained in Chapter 14. A very few, however, including the *Neustes Spielbuch* of 1840, already mentioned, speak of a four-handed game with declarations and fixed partnerships; the account is usually cursory, amounting in *Der Meister in allen Kartenspielen*, published in Hamburg in 1810, which contains the first reference to the game, to no more than two sentences. In the *Neuster Spiel-Almanach* of Carl König, probably to be dated to the 1890s, the game is referred to as Tarok-Whist. This name is based only on a faint analogy, the fact that the game was played by four players in fixed partnerships, a form of play going back to the very origins of Tarot and owing nothing to the spread of Whist from England to the Continent. The name is nevertheless convenient, and we may adopt it. The game itself was probably never a very popular one; it represents a rather clumsy attempt to superimpose some of the features of the classic three-handed game upon the four-handed Lombard/Viennese one.

Tarok-Whist

There are four players in fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. A 78-card French-suited pack is used; the XXI is called the *Mongur*, the I the *Pagat* and the Fool the *Skis*. Deal and play are *clockwise*. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player, in three rounds of five each and one round of four; in the last round, he takes the last two cards for himself, and then discards two cards, which count for his side. He may not discard a King or a trump (but may discard the Skis if he wishes). When the dealer has discarded, he says '*Es liegt*', the player on his left makes any declarations he can, and then each of the other players in turn does the same. The possible declarations are those which prevail in the three-handed game, in the third version (about 1820) described in the next chapter. Or, at least, this is what the card-game books say. It is difficult to believe, however, that there was not some adjustment made for the four-handed game: a declaration of sixteen Ladons (suit cards other than court cards), for example, would be exceedingly rare on a hand of nineteen cards. For the declaration of ten or more Taroks, therefore, one of eight or more may have been substituted, and, for one of sixteen or more Ladons, one of twelve or more. This is, however, a mere guess. In any case, the maker of a declaration is paid individually by each of the other players, including his partner, the payments being made as soon as the round of declarations is completed.

The player to the dealer's left leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out according to the usual rules. The Skis serves as Excuse, and a card is given in exchange for it; but if it is played in any of the last five tricks, it is captured by the winner of the trick. The suit cards rank in their original order. If a player wins the last trick with the Pagat, his side obtains a bonus of 15 points; Carl König recognises a similar bonus for winning the last trick with a King (but not for capturing one's partner's King with a trump). At the end of the round each side reckons the points on cards they have won in tricks: the cards are counted in *fours*, the dealer's two discarded cards counting as a full set of four, with standard values for the counting cards, so that there are 72 points altogether. To their point-total each side adds the points for the declarations either partner has made (although these have already been paid individually) and for Pagat or King ultimo: the side having the larger grand total then marks as its score the difference between their total and the opponents', and keeps a cumulative score from round to round. A game consists of four rounds. At the end of the game, each member of the winning side is paid by one of the losers as many game points as his side has a final score in excess of that of the losers. If, however, the winners have at least 36 points more than the losers, this sum is doubled; if the losers have a nil recorded score, it is also doubled; and if the losers have a nil recorded score and the winners have a recorded score of 36 points or more, it is trebled. *NS* (1840) adds that the winners add to this payment the game points for all the declarations that either of them has made during the four rounds; Carl König recognises no such addition.

There was, however, one place where a four-handed classic game was highly popular, namely Munich. This was played with an enlarged pack of 103 cards, larger even than the 97-card pack used for Minchiate. This 103-card pack was formed by duplicating twenty-five of the cards in a 78-card French-suited pack; as there is no record of such a pack being manufactured, this was probably done by borrowing cards from a second pack with the same backs. The practice is first mentioned in the *KW* of 1756, and repeatedly referred to in later texts down to the first decade of the nineteenth century, when the references to it peter out. Unfortunately not one of these sources gives a detailed description of the game. According to the *KW*, the cards duplicated are the trumps from XIII to XXI, the Pagat, the Scüs and the whole of the Heart suit. This is confirmed by *HR* and by all the other card-game books that mention the game. K.A. Bierdimpfl, however, in the introduction to his catalogue, *Die Sammlung der Spielkarten des baierischen Nationalmuseums*, published at Munich in 1884, says that the cards duplicated were all twenty-one trumps, the Sküs and the King, Cavall and Ace of Hearts. Bierdimpfl is not a very trustworthy guide to the history of Tarot cards, and he uses the past tense, as referring to a vanished custom; on the other hand, he was a native of Munich, and so his testimony cannot be discounted. *KW* says that the game played with this pack was for four players, something we could have surmised in any case, since the addition of twenty-five cards must have been designed to enable four players each to have the same number of cards, namely twenty-five, as in the three-handed game. It also says that the discard was of two cards, which can hardly be correct: we must surely assume that the dealer gave each player twenty-five cards and took the last three for himself, discarding three. *KW* then further adds, 'As we have been assured, the rules to be observed are almost exactly the same as is usual in the game of Tarock for four, which we shall set out below': this occurs towards the end of the section preceding the exposition of the Lombard/Viennese game. One would therefore deduce that the Munich game was played with fixed partnerships but without declarations or bonuses; but it is conceivable that *KW* has borrowed this remark from some earlier source in which it referred to some other four-handed game. But for this remark, I should be inclined to think that the game played in Munich with the 103-card pack was an adaptation of three-handed classic Tarot with declarations and bonuses; and it could therefore be that it was an example of that comparative rarity, a four-handed game without fixed or temporary partnerships, in which each of the four players played for himself alone. The most salient question concerning the manner of play is what happened when two cards of the same denomination were played to the same trick. The rule could be either that the one played earlier beat the other, or that the one played later beat the other: the game would be more interesting and difficult under the latter rule. If the *KW* statement of the cards duplicated is correct, and it is assumed that the counting cards had their standard values and that the cards were counted in fours, with the dealer's three discarded cards counting as if they formed a full set of four, then there would have been exactly 100 points altogether; under the same assumptions, if Bierdimpfl's statement of the cards duplicated is preferred, there would be 96 points altogether. Unfortunately, the amount of information concerning this unusual game that has come down to us is too scanty to make it worth attempting to reconstruct the rules.

CHAPTER TWELVE

Grosstarock

The classic three-handed game which had probably originated in France underwent an intensive development in Germany; and it was principally in the form that evolved there that it spread to the Netherlands and to Scandinavia, although there is no clear sign that the new ideas introduced into it in Germany were ever adopted in France. In Germany the game came to be known, from about the middle of the nineteenth century on, as Grosstarock, although this name was not used elsewhere. The name was coined at a time when the more traditional form of Tarock game, played with the full 78-card pack, which it exemplified, was under severe challenge from the newer type of game, played with a shortened 54-card pack, to which Part IV will be devoted. It would be a mistake, however, to regard Grosstarock as having been invented as a new game to replace the classic game described in the last chapter. On the contrary, it evolved very gradually out of it, by the addition of new features, and, in the earlier books, is presented simply as the standard form of Tarock as played at the time. Moreover, the development was not uniform: as the new ideas were introduced, some players adopted them and others did not; moreover, some players interpreted them in one way and others in a different way. Although what was in broad outline the same game was played in Germany and other countries from well before the beginning of the nineteenth century until well after its end, and was considered throughout that period to be the leading type of game played with the 78-card pack, it is probable that at no time did any two circles of players, or at least those of any two regions, observe exactly the same rules.

This makes it somewhat confusing to describe. In fact, all the distinctive new ideas had been introduced by 1820; and I shall begin by setting out the game as described in each of the four independent German accounts up to that date. Grosstarock seems to have continued to be played in Germany until at least the first World War; in most of Austria it must have died out during the 1830s, but it seems to have survived in the Tyrol. In his *Illustrirtes Wiener Tarokbuch*, published in the 1890s, S. Ulmann stated that the 78-card pack was still in use in southern Bavaria, Switzerland and the Tyrol; it continued to be manufactured by both Dondorf and Wüst of Frankfurt until at least the 1880s, and by Piatnik of Vienna even down to the present day.

The earliest account known to me of the game I am here calling Grosstarock is that given in the 1783 edition of *Das neue Königliche l'Hombre* (*KH*), published in Hamburg, a work that first appeared in 1726 and went through numerous editions, the later ones dealing not only with Ombre but with other card games. The *KH* account is a reprinting, with significant emendations, of that of *KW* (1756), cited in Chapter 11. Another work containing an independent revision of the *KW* text is *Der beliebte Weltmensch, welcher lehret die üblichen Arten der Spiele* (*BW*), published in Vienna in 1795. The game described in these two works, called *Taroc al ordinaire* in *BW*, is substantially the same, save for the rules governing declarations, which differ considerably: the following account is therefore based on both texts, but the section on declarations has been divided. The game remains essentially identical with the mature form of classic three-handed German Tarock as described in the last chapter. The salient new feature is one that is hardly emphasised in either text: if just one player makes no tricks at all, each of the other players making at least one trick, the ordinary scores for points on cards are cancelled, and the player with no tricks scores as if he had won all the points. This rule not only helped to counterbalance the luck of the deal, but it gave a player with a weak hand a choice of objectives. Moreover, in certain situations it made the play of a hand much more delicate, because an attempt to win all the tricks that failed in the last few tricks could easily result in just one player's making no tricks. It is this feature, usually called *Stichfreispiel*, but also known as *Null, Nullstich* or, occasionally, *Misere*, whose presence I am taking as the criterion for distinguishing Grosstarock from the earlier classic game; but it must again be emphasised that no one had any thought of devising a new game, the rule about *Stichfreispiel* slipping in as a minor new variation, and that the name *Grosstarock* is itself an anachronism when used of Tarock games before the later nineteenth century.

KH introduces certain new features into the declarations. One is the use of the Scüs as a wild card – the so-called leaping (*springende*) Scüs – in a declaration of Matadors. Of greater importance is the recognition of seven Kings, the Mongue (XXI), Pagat and Scüs counting for purposes of declarations as Kings alongside the so-called 'natural' or suit Kings, a feature which later led to the occasional adoption of the name *Siebenkönigsspiel* (game of seven Kings) for Grosstarock. Before setting out the rules of the game, I will lay down some convenient conventions of notation for declarations, to be used in the rest of this chapter.

Conventions of Terminology

A declaration of 'Ten Taroks' may be made whenever a player has ten or more Taroks; he need not specify how many he has, and, if he is required to show them and has more than ten, he may show any ten. A declaration of 'Ten or more Taroks' means that a player may declare any definite number of Taroks from ten upwards; likewise for 'Three or more Kings', 'Three or more Matadors', etc. With any of these declarations, a notation like '10 + 5 game points' means that the player making the declaration is paid by each of the other players 10 game points for the basic number of cards declared, e.g. 10 game points for ten Taroks or three Matadors, and is paid 5 additional game points for each card in excess of the basic number, and hence 15 in all for eleven Taroks or four Matadors, 20 for twelve Taroks or five Matadors, and so on. 'Three or more Matadors (from above)' means that three Matadors consist of the Mongue (XXI), Pagat and Scüs, and that any larger number of Matadors consists of these three cards together with trumps in unbroken sequence from the XX down. 'With leaping Scüs' means that the Scüs may, in a declaration of Matadors, be regarded as replacing some *one* card, other than the XXI or Pagat, provided that the card immediately below it is present: e.g., when there is a leaping Scüs, the XXI, Pagat, Scüs and XIX constitute four Matadors, and the XXI, Pagat, Scüs, XX and XVIII five. When the phrase 'with leaping Scüs' is omitted, this rule does not apply. 'Matadors (from above and below)' means that one may also include, in a declaration of Matadors, any trumps in unbroken upward sequence from the II: thus the XXI, Pagat, Scüs, II and III would make a declaration of five Matadors. When the declared cards do not have to be shown, it is unnecessary to state whether the Matadors are from above or below. It is presumably possible to combine in a single declaration Matadors both from above and from below, e.g. XXI, Pagat, Scüs, XX and II, but this is never made explicit. 'Matadors (from above and from below without XXI)' means that the XXI is not required when the Matadors are from below only; the Scüs, Pagat and II will then constitute a possible declaration of three Matadors. The rule is often clearly stated in this way; it is, nevertheless, unreasonable: if the Pagat is required, as it always is, for a declaration of Matadors from above, then, by parity, the XXI should be required for a declaration of Matadors from below. 'Three or more Kings (out of seven)' means that the XXI, Pagat and Scüs are recognised as Kings, making, with the four natural Kings, seven Kings in all, and that any three or more of these may be declared; it is obvious that at least one player must be able to make such a declaration. When the expression 'out of seven' is missing, 'Kings' must be taken to apply only to natural Kings. Unless otherwise specified, any one or more cards may be used in declarations of different types: e.g. the XXI, Pagat and Scüs may form part of a declaration of three or more Kings and also of a declaration of three or more Matadors, and likewise Matadors may be included in a declaration of ten Taroks, etc. Declarations of the same type are bracketed together: one cannot use the same cards for declarations of the same type, e.g. the same three cards as part of a complete Cavallerie and also, with the Scüs, for a half Cavallerie. The Scüs may be used for half Cavallerie declarations in two or more suits.

Three-handed Taroc (Germany and Austria, c. 1780-1800)

Deal and discard

A 78-card French-suited pack is used; deal and play are counter-clockwise. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in five rounds of five cards each, starting with the player to his right, and, in the last round of the deal, takes the last three cards for himself. He then discards three cards, which count to him at the end of the round; the discard is called the *Scat.* He may never discard Kings, and is always permitted to discard the Scüs. He may discard a Taroc (trump) only if he leaves himself with no Taroc in his hand, and then only in either of the following cases; he discards the Pagat and two other Tarocs; or he discards the Pagat, the Scüs and one other Taroc. *KH* expressly notes that, under this rule, the Mongue (XXI) may be discarded. *KH*, but not *BW*, gives it as a rule observed by some, but not by all, players that, if any player has only one or two Tarocs in his hand at the end of the deal, the deal is annulled.

Declarations

(a) Austrian form

BW gives a rule not found in any other version: a declaration does not need to be made before the first card is led, but may be made in the course of play at any time up to the moment when a card of the set declared is first played; e.g. a player may declare 'All four Kings' just before he first plays a King. Distinct declarations may be made at different times by the same player under this rule, but a declaration of ten Tarocs must be made before the player first plays a Taroc. The cards declared must be shown to the other players. The permissible declarations are:

Ten Tarocs (not including the Scüs) – 10 game points.

A Cavalerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A half Cavalerie (any three court cards of one suit with the Scüs) – 5 game points.

All four Kings – 10 game points.
Three Kings with the Scüs – 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above) – 15 + 5 game points.

Settlement is made immediately for each declaration. The dealer is not, of course, allowed to include in a declaration a card he has discarded.

(b) German form

Declarations are made in turn, starting with the dealer, as soon as he has made his discard, and before a card is led to the first trick. Settlement is made between players as soon as all have had a chance to make declarations. The permissible declarations are:

Ten Tarocs (not including the Scüs) – 10 game points.

A Cavalerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A *scüsirte* Cavalerie (the King and any other two court cards of one suit with the Scüs) – 5 game points.

Three or more Kings (out of seven) – 5 + 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above, with leaping Scüs) – 10 + 5 game points.

The cards declared must be shown to the other players. The recognition of seven Kings is stated to be a recent addition to the game. Some players require that, if a player who has declared ten Tarocs fails to make more than 26 points on the cards he wins in tricks, he must at the end of the round restore to the other two players the payment he received for the declaration.

Play

The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. Play is under the usual rules, and, in the suits, the cards rank in their original order. The Scüs serves as Excuse. When it is played, it is taken back and laid among the cards won in tricks: if he can, the player gives a low card in exchange for it from among the cards he has already won, but not from the dealer's discard; otherwise, he does so as soon as he can. *BW* specifies that, if the player who had the Scüs makes no trick at all, he surrenders it at the end of the round to the player who won the trick to which it was played. *KH* says, on the contrary, that he does not surrender it, but counts 4 points for it; but this rule is inappropriate in the presence of a score for *Stichfreispiel*, and the *BW* rule is to be assumed to be the correct one (see Note 1 below). The Scüs may not be played to the last three tricks; *KH* specifies that if, at the beginning of the twenty-second trick, the player with the lead has the Scüs, he must surrender the lead to the player to his right, and must play the Scüs. Both texts agree that some players allow the Scüs to be led to a trick, in which case the other players must play Tarocs if they can; *KH* specifies that this may be done only so long as at least one of the other players still has a Taroc, and both texts agree that some players do not allow this at all. There is no requirement to play the Scüs if unable to follow suit or trump.

Bonuses and penalties

A player who loses the Pagat to a higher Taroc must pay 5 game points to each of the other players, or 10 if it happens in the last trick; one who wins the last trick with the Pagat receives a bonus of 10 game points from each of the other two. Some players recognise additional bonuses and penalties for Kings: a penalty of 4 (*BW*) or 5 (*KH*) game points for losing a King in a trick before the last; a penalty of 10 game points for losing one in the last trick; and a bonus of 10 game points for winning the last trick with a King; the stated sum is paid to or by each of the other two players. When these bonuses and penalties for Kings are recognised, there is also a special bonus of 30 game points, paid by each of the others, for winning the last trick but one with the Pagat and the last trick with the Mongue (XXI).[1]

Scoring

The cards are counted in threes, the counting cards having their standard values, so that there are 78 points altogether. If just one player makes no tricks, each of the others making at least one, he is paid 26 game points by each of his opponents; though not explicitly stated, it is to be presumed that the dealer's discard does not count for this purpose as a trick. Except in this case, each player who has more than 26 points receives, in all, as many game points as he has points above 26, and each player who has less than 26 points pays, in all, as many game points as he has points below 26. A player who makes all 78 points is thus paid 26 game points by each of the other two, the same as one who makes none; presumably the dealer's discard is surrendered to an opponent who makes all the tricks, though this is not stated.

Notes

(1) The *KH* rule that one who makes no tricks does not surrender the Scüs is surely an innappropriate survival from the *KW* text; it must have been changed as soon as the *Stichfreispiel* was introduced. A player who finds the Scüs in his hand cannot win all the tricks, unless he is the dealer and discards it; it would be unreasonable if he also could not make a *Stichfreispiel*, and even more unreasonable that a player who won all the tricks should be prevented from gaining all 78 points by the fact that another player had had the Scüs in his hand. This would not be the only example in *KH* of a careless repetition from *KW* of something no longer applicable. The earlier stratum of *KW* gives, as an illustration, the earning of 34 game points by a player who declares ten Tarocs, three Matadors and a complete Cavalerie and wins the last trick with the Pagat. This comes from a stage when a Cavalerie was worth only 4 game points, there being 10 game points each for the ten Tarocs, the three Matadors and the Pagat ultimo. *BW* gives the same illustration with an amended value of 45 game points; but the sentence about the 34 game points is not only carelessly, and confusingly, repeated in *KH*, but reappears in many other accounts of Grosstarock throughout the nineteenth century, usually misinterpreted by their authors as a special additional bonus for making the Pagat ultimo when one has also made these three particular declarations.

(2) The rule about the leaping Scüs is stated by *KH* in a somewhat ambiguous way: it could be taken to mean that the Scüs could be used to fill more than one gap, provided that each consisted of only one card, so that, e.g., the XXI, Pagat, Scüs, XX, XVIII and XVI would constitute an acceptable declaration. This was certainly sometimes done, but I do not think that it is what is intended here. *KH* also states that, in a declaration of *scüsirte* Matadors, the score is only 5 + 5 game points. This could mean that the XXI, Pagat, Scüs, XX and XVIII score only 15 game points; but I think it means that one counts 5 game points plus 5 for the XX, 5 for the Scüs as replacing the XIX and 5 for the XVIII, making 20 in all. Provided that only one gap can be filled by the Scüs, the result will then be the same as under the rule as I stated it above, on the interpretation given by the *Conventions of Terminology*, namely 10 game points for the first three (XXI, Pagat and Scüs) plus 5 game points for each of the other cards actually present, that is, in this example, the XX and the XVIII. If, after all, the Scüs is allowed to fill more than one gap, the two rules will diverge in effect. On the method of reckoning stated in *KH*, as I am understanding it, the XXI, Pagat, Scüs, XX, XVIII and XVI would count 30 game points – the basic 5 game points plus 5 each for the XX, the Scüs as replacing the XIX, the XVIII, the Scüs as replacing the XVII, and the XVI; whereas, on the method I

---

[1] Winning the last two tricks with the Pagat and the XXI, in that order, is a difficult feat, since it requires clearing trumps, before the penultimate trick, without the help of the XXI, and therefore deserves a high bonus. Simply winning the last trick with the XXI is not at all so difficult as doing so with the Pagat or with a (natural) King, since the latter two both require trumps to have been cleared before the last trick, while the former demands only retaining the XXI until that trick. Nevertheless, it is possible that, when seven Kings are recognised and there is a bonus for winning the last trick with a King, this may be gained by means of the XXI as well as with a natural King. This interpretation was certainly adopted in some later versions of the game; the probabilities are against it in the present version, but the text is not explicit.

stated above, such a declaration would be worth only 25 game points.

(3) *KH* mentions Matadors from below as a recent innovation, but does not explain them, and I have therefore omitted then from the above account.

The next independent account of Grosstarock made its first appearance, so far as I know, in the *Neuster Spielalmanach für das Jahr 1800* (*NSa* 1800) by Julius Cäsar, published in Berlin and referred to in the last chapter. This account was repeatedly reprinted, for instance in the *Neuestes Spielbuch* published in Vienna in 1802, the *Berliner Almanach für Karten-, Schach- und Pharospieler auf das Jahr 1804* and the *Spielalmanach für Karten, Schach, etc.* (*SK*), by Julius Cäsar published in Berlin in 1815. The game had not undergone a great deal of change in the intervening time; indeed, the rule governing payment for a *Stichfreispiel* is given only as optional. Nevertheless, there are a few important divergences.

Three-handed German Tarok (about 1800)

All is as in the preceding version, with the following exceptions.

Deal and discard

The variant rule that the deal is annulled if any player has only one or two trumps (Taroks) is not mentioned: obviously, with the introduction of the *Stichfreispiel*, such a holding could be a great advantage, provided that the trumps are not too high. The dealer who finds himself with the Pagat and just two other Taroks, or one Tarok and the Scüs, has the same privilege as before of discarding all three, even if one of them is the XXI, with the exception that he cannot discard the Pagat and two other Taroks if he also has the Scüs. If the dealer discards the Pagat in this way, he is entitled at the end of play to the bonus of 10 game points for bringing home the Pagat.

Declarations

The declared cards are not required to be shown to the other players: the declarations are made simply by announcing the type of declaration and the number of cards. No more information need be given: in a declaration of Kings, one need not say which ones one has, one need not specify the suit of a Cavallerie, nor, it seems, need it be said whether the Scüs is included in a declaration of ten or more Taroks. (On the other hand, a complete Cavallerie and a half *scüsirte* Cavallerie must be distinguished, although they score the same.) In *NSa* (1800) it is expressly stated that, in a declaration of ten or more Taroks, one does not need to say whether or not the Pagat is included. This remark is repeated in the later books, but, in those of 1804 and 1815, with a footnote stating that it is usual for a player making a declaration of ten or more Taroks to add 'with' or 'without' to indicate the inclusion or exclusion of the Pagat. A player who declares ten or more Taroks is paid irrespective of whether he makes more than 26 points on his tricks. The permissible declarations are as follows:

Ten or more Taroks (possibly including the Scüs) – 10 + 5 game points.

A complete Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A complete Cavallerie with the Scüs – 20 game points.
A half Cavallerie (*any* three court cards of one suit) – 5 game points.
A half Cavallerie with the Scüs – 10 game points.

Three or more Kings (out of seven) – 5 + 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above) – 10 + 5 game points.

The Scüs may be used in more than one Cavallerie declaration. There is no mention of the leaping Scüs, but it is stated that some players allow a declaration of Matadors from below; this is explained as being *without* the XXI, so that Pagat, Scüs and II make three Matadors.

Play

The Scüs may legally be played to one of the last three tricks, but is then lost to the winner of the trick. No mention is made of its being possible to lead the Scüs to a trick, or, having the lead, to surrender it to the next player.

A curious rule is stated that, if the Pagat is captured, it (and presumably the trick to which it was played) belongs to that one of the two opponents of the player who held the Pagat who scored least on the declarations. This seems like a clumsy attempt to offset the high scores that could sometimes be made on declarations. The rule reappears, mostly in a garbled form, in many later accounts, but probably it was seldom observed.

Bonuses and penalties

A player who wins a trick with the Pagat is paid 10 game points by each of the other players, or 20 game points if it is the last trick. One who loses the Pagat to a higher Tarok pays 10 game points to each of the other players, or 20 game points if he does so in the last trick. A player who wins a trick with a natural King is paid 5 game points by each of the other players, or 10 game points if it is the last trick. Likewise, one who loses a natural king pays 5 game points to each of the other players, or 10 game points if it happens in the last trick. The penalties are evidently paid immediately, but the bonuses are paid only at the end of the round: if a King or the Pagat has been brought home (i.e. the Player who held it has won a trick with it), it is not placed among the player's tricks, but face up beside them; at the end, each player reckons 10 game points for the Pagat and 5 for each King (doubling them for one made ultimo) and, between any two players, the one with the lower total pays the difference. There is no bonus for winning the last trick with the XXI.

Some players have, in addition, an ultimo pot. Into this each player puts a fixed amount at the beginning and whenever it is empty. A players who wins the last trick with the Pagat takes the whole pot, one who wins it with a King takes half the pot. A player who loses the Pagat in the last trick doubles the amount in the pot, one who loses a King in the last trick adds to the amount in the pot half as much again.

Scoring

The award of 26 game points from each opponent for making a *Stichfreispiel* is, as already mentioned, given in *NSa* (1800) as an optional rule. In a few paragraphs added to the text in *SK* (1815), however, it is presented as mandatory – the card-game books no doubt as usual lagging behind practice. The problem of the Scūs played by one who makes no tricks is not treated; we must presume that, at least when a *Stichfreispiel* is allowed, the problem does not arise, as was suggested for the preceding version of the game, and likewise for the dealer's discard.

NSa (1800) prefaces its account with the remark that Tarok was formerly a much simpler game, without seven Kings, Matadors from below or a *scūsirte* Cavallerie. This remark keeps cropping up in accounts of Tarok for the next thirty years. *NSa* also states that Tarok is played either in a three- or in a two-handed form – testimony to the relative unimportance of any type of four-handed game. The description of the three-handed game contains much advice on strategy. For the author, all the interest of the game was centred on bringing home or capturing the Pagat and the Kings, and on trying to win the last trick with one of them or preventing this; he goes so far as to say that, once the Pagat and the Kings have been played, the remainder of the round is uninteresting. If no player has declared ten or more Taroks, the two players who do not have the Pagat will probably begin the round with an attempt to catch the Pagat by playing Taroks. Each of these players will, on his first Tarok lead, lead a low Tarok if he has eight or nine in his hand, and a high one if he has seven or fewer. They continue playing Taroks until either the Pagat falls or it becomes evident that the attempt to catch it will fail. In the latter case, they next attempt to force the Pagat out before the last trick, by leading a long suit, called a *Peitsche*, which the holder of the Pagat will eventually have to trump. If a declaration of ten or more trumps has been made, it is dangerous to attack the Pagat without being sure that it is not held by the one who made the declaration (here the rule about saying 'with' or 'without' is of importance). Once the Pagat has been played, the players turn to trying to force out, or if possible to capture, the Kings: a player is best advised to try to force out the Kings he does not hold before playing out his own. He will thus repeatedly lead a suit in which he lacks a King; but he must stop immediately one of the other players trumps that suit. If, in the earlier stage, the player who has the Pagat sees that the attack against it is bound to succeed, he may play it at once, to avoid losing all his Taroks; but he will hold it up as long as possible if he has two or more Kings, so as to postpone the play to force them out.

A quite new text appeared in the *Neuster Speilalmanach für Karten, Schach*, etc., (*NSK*) by G.W. von Abenstein, published in Berlin in 1820, and was reprinted with small changes in the *Neustes Spiel-Taschenbuch* of T.F. Müller (Ulm, 1830) and the *Neustes Spielbuch* (Leipzig, 1840), already mentioned. This contains some important innovations. One is a declaration of four Queens, four Cavalls or four Jacks. Another is a declaration of sixteen or more Latons, a Laton or Ladon being a numeral card of one of the suits. This is a method of compensating a player for being dealt poor cards, alternative to the payment for a *Stichfreispiel*: alternative because the possibility of making no tricks may depend upon the other players' not at first realising that you have that intention, and it is therefore dangerous to alert them by making a declaration of Latons. Both these new types of declaration were henceforward to be regular features of the game. But of much greater importance was the introduction of announcements at various stages of play, of an intention to make no tricks or to make all the tricks, with an extra bonus for succeeding and a penalty for failing. (In general, I shall attempt, as far as possible, to use the word 'declaration' for a statement that one has some special combination of cards in one's hand, and the word 'announcement' for an expression of intention to accomplish a certain feat in play.) Such announcements are not bids, in the sense of bids at Ombre or at Bridge, since they are not part of an auction: but they share with Bridge bids the character of a contract voluntarily undertaken which determines the objectives of the players during that round. They were to become a most important feature of many later forms of Tarock.

Three-handed German Tarok (about 1820)

Deal and discard

Deal and play are *clockwise*. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player in five rounds of five cards each, starting with the player on his left, and, in the last round, takes the last three cards for himself. He then discards three, which count for him at the end of the round. The restrictions on the discards are different from the previous versions of the game. The dealer may never discard Kings, *nor* the XXI. He may discard Taroks only if he has just three *or fewer*: these may include the Pagat, but not the XXI. He may always discard the Skis if he wishes. There is no annulment of the deal when a player has fewer than three Taroks. Nor is it said that the dealer, if he discards the Pagat, obtains the bonus for bringing the Pagat home.

Declarations

When the dealer has discarded, he says '*Es liegt*' ('It lies'). *The player to the dealer's left*, and not the dealer himself, then makes the first declaration, or passes. The other two then do the same in turn. Declared cards must be *shown* to the other players. The possible declarations are:

Ten or more Taroks (possibly including the Skis) – 10 + 5 game points.

A complete or natural Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A half or skisirte Cavallerie (*any* three court cards of one suit with the Skis) – 5 game points.

A complete natural Königreich (all four natural Kings) – 10 game points.
A half or skisirtes Königreich (three natural Kings with the Skis) – 5 game points.

Four Queens, four Cavalls or four Jacks – 5 game points.
Four Queens, four Cavalls or four Jacks, with the Skis – 10 game points.
Three Queens, three Cavalls or three Jacks with the Skis – 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above or below) – 15 + 5 game points.

Sixteen or more Latons (suit cards other than court cards, possibly including the Skis) – 10 + 5 game points.

The Skis may be used in more than one declaration. Note that it is, in effect, a completely wild card, capable of being used in place of a court card, a Tarok or a Laton: by using the Skis, one might have a declaration both of ten Taroks and of sixteen Latons. It is given as a variant rule that one does not have to show ten or more declared Taroks. In this case one merely says either 'So many Taroks' or 'So many Taroks and the Skis', adding '*avec*' ('with') or '*sans*' ('without') to indicate whether or not one has the Pagat. Though no declaration is obligatory, one may not declare fewer Taroks than one has; similarly with the other declarations. A declaration of ten or more Taroks is paid irrespective of the points gained on tricks.

If the player to the dealer's left declares a complete Cavallerie, another player may declare a half Cavallerie with the Skis only if the missing court card is either the King or the Jack. The player to the dealer's left may declare three Queens, Cavalls or Jacks with the Skis only if he also has at least three Kings; the other two players may do so only if the player to the dealer's left has not declared a complete Königreich. The point of these complicated restrictions is obscure.

The XXI, with the Pagat and the Skis, must be included in every declaration of Matadors, even when they are from below. The use of a leaping Skis is mentioned as a variant rule: it may replace just one Tarok (other than the XXI or Pagat) in the sequence; such a declaration still earns 5 game points for each card actually present.

Players settle between each other as soon as the round of declarations is over.

Play

The player to the left of the dealer leads to the first trick, and play is under the usual rules, the suit cards ranking in their original order. The Skis serves as Excuse, but is captured if it is played to any of the last *five* tricks. The Skis may be led to a trick, in which case the other players must play Taroks if they can; this can happen only so long as at least one other player has a Tarok. It is expressly stated that, when a player has no Taroks left, he is not obliged to play the Skis when a plain suit is led in which he is void. In playing the Skis, one says '*Ich skisire mich*' (a mock-German rendering of '*Je m'excuse*').

Bonuses and penalties

A player who wins a trick with the Pagat is paid 5 game points by each opponent, or 10 game points if it is the last trick; one who loses the Pagat to a higher Tarok pays 5 game points to each opponent, or 10 game points if it happens in the last trick. One who wins a trick with a King is paid 5 game points by each opponent, whether it is the last trick or an earlier one; one who loses a King to a Tarok pays 5 game points to each opponent, again whether it is in the last trick or earlier. There is no mention of an ultimo pot.

Scoring and announcements

At the end of the round, each player reckons his points as usual, counting in threes with standard values for the counting cards. Provided that each player has made at least one trick, and there have been no announcements, each player with more than 26 points receives, in all, as many game points as he has points above 26, and each one with less than 26 points pays, in all, as many game points as he has points below 26.

A player is *stichfrei* if he has made no tricks, but each of the other two players has made at least one trick: it is expressly stated that, in this context, the dealer's discard (*Scat*) does not count as a trick, nor is a player hindered from being *stichfrei* by having had the Skis. If there has been no announcement, no regard is paid to the points the players have won in tricks, and each of the opponents pay the *stichfrei* player 26 game points. If, in the course of play, a player who is trying to make a *Stichfreispiel* is forced to take a trick, then, if he still has either a court card or a Tarok in his hand, play continues and the points are reckoned as usual. If, however, he no longer has any court card or Tarok, he has the option, if he wishes, of throwing his hand in immediately he is forced to take a trick; play then ceases. If this happens before the thirteenth trick, the points are then reckoned on the tricks taken to date: the player who was attempting the *Stichfreispiel* pays in game points to each opponent the difference between the opponent's present point-total and his own (which can include the points in the *Scat* if he was dealer). (Note that this is not so great an advantage. If the hands are played out, and he ends with just one point, he will have to pay only 25 game points altogether; if he throws in his hand, and the other players have already obtained 20 points each on their tricks, while he, having been dealer, has as many as 8 points, he will still have to pay 24 game points, i.e. 12 to each.) If the unsuccessful *stichfrei* player, being forced to take a trick, throws in at or after the thirteenth trick, he will need to pay each opponent only as many game points as that opponent has points on the unplayed cards remaining in his hand, together with those in the *Scat*, if the opponent was dealer; this, if it happens late enough in the round, could be a great advantage.

A player may announce an intention of making a *Stichfreispiel*, either before the first trick, immediately after the declarations have been concluded, or before the thirteenth trick. If he announces before the first trick, and succeeds, each opponent pays him 36 game points altogether; if he fails, he must pay each opponent 10 game points in addition to what he otherwise owes him. If he announces before the thirteenth trick, and succeeds, each opponent pays him 31 game points altogether; if he fails, he must pay each opponent 5 game points in addition to what he otherwise owes him.

Winning all the tricks is called *Vole*: one who makes *Vole* is again paid 26 game points by each opponent, which means, in effect, that the Skis and, if he was not dealer, the *Scat* are surrendered to him. An intention to make *Vole* can also be announced: before the first, before the thirteenth or before the twentieth trick. If a player announces *Vole* before the first trick, and succeeds, he is paid 52 game points (inclusive of the score for points on the cards won) by each opponent; if he announces before the thirteenth trick, and succeeds, he is paid 38 game points by each; and if he announces before the twentieth trick, and succeeds, he is paid 31 game points by each. If he announces *Vole* and fails, he pays the full amount (52, 38 or 31 game points) to each opponent, but this is mitigated by the usual payment for points on cards won in tricks.

Note on bonuses and penalties

It is specifically stated that a player who makes *Vole* and in addition wins the last trick with the Pagat receives the bonus of 10 game points from each opponent for the latter feat, as well as the payment for *Vole*. It is, however, laid down that when there is a *Stichfreispiel*, whether this is successful or unsuccessful, the bonuses for winning a trick with King and the penalties for losing a King are *not* paid. The same applies when there is a successful *Vole*. It also applies when there is an unsuccessful *Vole*, but 'only as long as the player's plan remains undisclosed or has not yet been frustrated', *NSK* (1820) says; *NS* (1840) alters this to 'but only if it is not announced or not yet defeated'. Both texts then add that, as soon as the player attempting *Vole* has lost a trick, the payments for bringing home or losing a King are restored. *NSK* (1820) adds that the players may prefer to dispense with the rule altogether. Neither text says anything about the bonus or penalty for bringing home or losing the Pagat in a trick before the last when a *Stichfreispiel* or *Vole* is played.

These remarks are not quite easy to interpret. It is clear that there is no payment for Kings won or lost if a *Stichfreispiel* or *Vole* is achieved, if a *Stichfreispiel* is announced or if a player attempting to make a *Stichfreispiel* throws in his hand, when he is forced to take a trick. It is therefore evident that it will be convenient to make payments for Kings, if they are to be made, only at the end of the round, and not at the time the King is won or lost. In the case of an unsuccessful *Vole*, the most probable interpretation is that payments are made only for those Kings which are won or lost after the *Vole* was announced, or, if it is not announced, after the first trick lost by the player attempting the *Vole*. This will mean in practice that, so long as there has been no announcement of *Vole*, no payment will be made for Kings won or lost at a stage of the round when only one player has so far won any tricks. It is not likely, however, that the same principle applies to an unannounced and unsuccessful *Stichfreispiel*: a player whose unannounced *Stichfreispiel* is defeated, but who elects not to throw his hand in, has in effect chosen that the round shall be scored normally, and so surely cannot evade the usual payments for Kings. It is conceivable that, when payments for Kings are suspended, so is payment for the Pagat won or lost before the last trick; it would, for instance, be hard on the winner of a *Stichfreispiel* to have to pay for having sacrificed his Pagat; nor, when it was in the hand of another player, could he be expected to help the third player to capture it. If so, the failure to mention it is a serious oversight on the part of the author of the *NSa* account.

Variants

In a brief appendix, *NSK* (1820) mentions two variant rules. One is that there is a King ultimo, i.e. that the bonus for bringing home, or penalty for losing, a King is increased to 10 game points if it happens in the last trick; in this case, the bonus for winning the last trick with the Pagat, or penalty for losing it in the last trick, is increased to 15 game points. The other variant rule, said to be observed by many, is the recognition of the XXI, Pagat and Scüs as forming, together with the four natural ones, seven Kings, of which one may declare three or more. It is not stated what the value of such a declaration is (presumably, as usual, 5 + 5 game points), nor whether it supersedes or is additional to the declaration of a natural Königreich. It is stated, however, that, when seven Kings are recognised, there is also a bonus for winning the last trick with the XXI, presumably of 10 game points. This appendix is omitted from the 1830 account but incorporated into the main text of *NS* (1840), with the remark that it is now usual to recognise seven Kings.

A little reflection shows that the difficulty concerning payments for Kings and the Pagat when there is a *Vole* or *Stichfreispiel* is not just a matter of a vaguely worded text, but is intrinsic: the bonuses and penalties do not fit well with the idea of a special award for making no tricks. If the payments for Kings and Pagat were to remain in force when a *Stichfreispiel* was made, the successful player might have to pay out 25 game points out of the 52 he won, or 30 if he had himself had the Pagat, as well as what he had to pay for the declarations of the other players. There must, therefore, be a rule suspending those payments when a *Stichfreispiel* is made; it is not so clear whether they ought to be suspended when there is an unsuccessful attempt at one, or, if so, just how the rule were best framed. It is not so essential that the payments be suspended when *Vole* is made; but, if they are not, the player who makes *Vole* will receive at least 30 additional game points, which will destroy the intended parity of reward between *Stichfreispiel* and *Vole*. To suspend them for *Vole* also has its disadvantages, however, since it creates an incentive for a player who might have made an unannounced *Vole* to lose an unnecessary trick early in the game so as to avail himself of the payments for the Kings and the Pagat, which would more than compensate for the few lost points on the cards, even if he does not have the *Scat*, though, of course, to counterbalance this there is the hope of being able to announce *Vole* at an intermediate stage. There is a problem here of adjusting the rules to create a due incentive for difficult feats of play, to which, so far as I know, the perfect solution was not found.

It is obvious that we do not have, in the three versions of Grosstarock set out above, a steady development. In the respects already mentioned – the new types of declaration and, particularly, the announcement of *Stichfreispiel* and of *Vole* – the 1820 version is more advanced in an evolutionary sense; but in certain other respects, such as the requirement that declared cards be shown to the other players, and the curious rule that Taroks must be played when the Skis is led, it resembles the 1783 one more than that of 1800. We must suppose that experimentation with the game in different directions proceeded simultaneously in different regions of Germany, although there is now no way of telling which versions flourished in which regions. The 1800 version evidently represents the high point of an attempt to make the whole interest of the game centre around the Pagat and the Kings. The 1820 text, on the other hand, is the first account of the game to discuss *Stichfreispiel* and *Vole* at length; in the extended disquisition on tactics which it contains, much advice is given – rather obvious advice, that need hardly be repeated here – not only on how to save and how to capture the Pagat, how to make and how to prevent the Pagat ultimo, but also on how to succeed in, and how to defeat, a *Stichfreispiel* and a *Vole*.

There was a plethora of card-game books produced in Germany in the nineteenth century, and almost all of them include Tarok; but, unfortunately, they do not help us much in tracing the development of Grosstarock in the second half of the century. If there had been any books devoted to Tarok alone, they could have been trusted more securely than the accounts in books describing several dozen different games. Every single later German description of Grosstarock can unhesitatingly be assigned to one of three categories, according as it agrees in outline with the description in the 1783, the 1800 or the 1820 text. Some simply reproduce the original text word for word, and in these cases we may presume that the compiler had no first-hand knowledge of the game. Others describe the game afresh, sometimes with certain minor variations. Some of these variations can be recognised as due to a misunderstanding of the original sources, and can be ignored; others probably represent the genuine practice of certain players. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that we can derive from these accounts a true picture of the later history of the game. Those that derive from the 1783 text are few and early, and can probably be set aside as giving a form of the game that, in so far as it differed from the 1800 version, was obsolete soon after the beginning of the century.[2] If we were to rely on the later printed accounts for a general view of Grosstarock in Germany in the second half of the nineteenth century, we should therefore have to suppose that the 1800 and 1820 versions represented distinct forms of the game that persisted largely unchanged for many decades, in different parts of Germany. I think it more likely, however, that the game was played with countless local variations, of which it is no longer possible to attain a conspectus. I will here set out the principal variant rules found in these later accounts.

The tradition of the 1800 version

Apart from the four books already mentioned, I know of six later ones whose descriptions of Tarok tally closely with the 1800 text.[3] None shows any marked divergence in the rules. All recognise seven Kings, and none admits a leaping Scüs: three unconditionally allow Matadors from below (without the XXI) as well as from above, one allows them from below as an option, and two allow them only from above. Two, of 1894 and 1900, agree on a curious variation on the usual value of 10 + 5 game points for a declaration of ten or more Taroks, namely:

> 10 game points for ten Taroks, 15 for eleven, 20 for twelve, 26 + 5 for thirteen or more.

The tradition of the 1820 version

Apart from the three books already mentioned, I know of seven later ones whose accounts of Tarok tally closely with the 1820 text.[4] Here there is considerably more variation. Three allow Matadors from above and below (always with the XXI) and three allow them only from above; one provides for a leaping Scüs, three allow it as an option, and two leave it unmentioned. Most require all declared cards to be shown, save for ten or more Taroks. When a declaration of Taroks is made, all require that it be stated whether or not the Scüs is included; three demand that the declarer should say '*avec*' or '*sans*' to indicate the presence or absence of the Pagat, two say that some observe this rule, and only one leaves it unmentioned. The following further variations occur:

---

[2] *Der Meister in allen Kartenspielen*, Hamburg and Altona, n.d., about 1810. *Taschenbuch aller Karten-, Kegel-, Brett- und Würfel-Spiele*, Lüneburg, n.d., about 1805. *Allgemeines Karten Spielbuch*, Vienna, 1846. The 1791 and 1797 editions of *Das neue Königliche l'Hombre* reprint the 1783 text.

[3] F. von Posert, *Zwei und siebenzig deutsche, französische und englische Kartenspiele*, Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1864; F. von Posert, *Deutsche, französische und englische Kartenspiele*, 3rd edition, Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1873; *Illustrirtes Allgemeines Familien-Spielbuch*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1882; Alban von Hahn, *Das Buch der Spiele*, Leipzig, 1894; Ernst Lange, *Das grosse Buch der Kartenspiele*, Berlin, 1900; F. von Posert, *Deutsche, französische und englische Kartenspiele*, 9th edition, Leipzig, 1901.

[4] C. von Alvensleben, *Encyclopädie der Spiele*, 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1855; Baron F. von Thalberg, *Der perfecte Kartenspieler*, Berlin, n.d., about 1875; Friedrich Anton, *Encyclopädie der Spiele*, 5th edition, Leipzig, 1889; S. Ulmann, *Illustrirtes Wiener Tarokbuch*, Vienna, n.d., about 1892, and *Das Buch der Familienspiele*, Vienna, about 1894; Carl König, *Neuster Spiel-Almanach*, Berlin, n.d., about 1892; Albert Stabenow, *Ausgewählte Kartenspiele*, Leipzig, 1908.

(a) Although Baron von Thalberg, writing probably in the 1870s, for the most part reproduces word for word the text of *NS* (1840), he gives two variant values for declarations:

Ten or more Taroks – 10 + 3 game points.
Sixteen or more Latons – 10 + 3 game points.

(b) Carl König, probably writing in the 1890s, says that many players take the red suits as ranking in the same order as the black ones, i.e. with the Ace as the lowest card. He allows Matadors only from above, and does not admit a leaping Scüs. He awards only 10 + 5 game points for ten or more Matadors, instead of the usual 15 + 5; this agrees with the tradition of the 1800 version, under which, however, since there are seven Kings, which König does not recognise, the first three Matadors earn 5 more game points when declared as three Kings. Furthermore, König does not require the presence of the Scüs for a half Königreich, which thus consists just of three natural Kings and earns 5 game points, or for a half Cavallerie, which consists of any three court cards of one suit and also earns 5 game points.

(c) S. Ulmann, also writing in the 1890s, gives the variant value:

Sixteen or more Ladons – 16 + 5 game points.

His schedule of bonuses for bringing home the Pagat or a King, and of penalties for losing one, is as follows:

	before last trick	in last trick
Pagat	5	15
Natural King	5	10
XXI	–	10

These bonuses and penalties are suspended when a *Stichfreispiel* is made.

(d) Albert Stabenow, writing in 1908, gives the bonuses and penalties for Pagat and Kings as in the 1800 version, that is, 10 game points for bringing home or losing the Pagat, and 20 in the last trick, 5 game points for bringing home or losing a King, and 10 in the last trick. He cites the same variant value for ten or more Taroks as was stated above under the tradition of the 1800 version, that is, 10 + 5 game points for from ten to twelve Taroks, 26 + 5 for thirteen or more. He is the only writer in the 1820 tradition to recognise seven Kings, at their usual rate of 5 + 5 game points for three or more. Three or more Matadors are awarded 10 + 5 game points, but of course the first three can also be declared as Kings; Matadors may be from above only, and there is no leaping Scüs. Stabenow is the only writer to recognise seven Kings *and* allow an additional declaration of a natural Königreich (for the usual 10 game points) or of a half Königreich with the Scüs (for the usual 5). He allows 10 game points for winning the last trick with the *Mond* (XXI).

Terminology

The spelling *Tarok* is usual throughout the nineteenth century; save for one appearance in 1810, *Tarock* is not used before 1894. The name *Gross-Tarok*, for the game, first appears in Carl König's work. The XXI is often called *der Mond*, sometimes *der Mongur* and sometimes just the XXI. The I is always *der Pagat*. The Fool is called *der Scüs*, *der Skis* or *der Skȳs*. Suit cards other than court cards are called *Ladons* or *Latons* or occasionally, at the end of the century, *Scartins*. The discard is usually *der Scat*. A slam is called *Vole*, *Allstich* or *Tout*. *Siebenkönigsspiel*, as a name for the game, does not figure in any of the card-game books: I owe it to the 1902 edition of Muret-Sanders's English/German dictionary (s.v. 'tarot').

It has been tempting to avoid references to 'the 1800 and 1820 versions' of the game by appropriating the name *Siebenkönigsspiel* for the former, in which seven Kings are almost always recognised, and to reserve the name *Grosstarock* for the latter, in which they hardly ever are. I have resisted this temptation, not so much because it would accentuate the anachronism involved in the present use of the name *Grosstarock*, but because it would convey a false picture of two distinct games recognised as such. If one makes no allowance for their reliance on one another, the card-game books give the impression that there were two largely independent traditions of play. Even if this was really so, there is no sign that nineteenth-century German Tarok players were aware of the fact: whichever version is described in a given book, it is almost always presented simply as the standard form of three-handed Tarok, not as a special game with a name of its own.

Grosstarock was also played in the Netherlands and in Denmark. We have already seen a form of the classic three-handed game, without the distinctive feature of a high score for making no tricks, played in the Netherlands in the mid-nineteenth century. The inference that the game had not developed as rapidly in the

Netherlands as in Germany is corroborated by an account found in two card-game books of the first half of the century, *Het Kaartspelen Gemakkelijk Gemaakt* (*KG*) and *Nieuwe Beschrijving der Meest Gebruikelijke Kaartspellen* (*NB*), published in Amsterdam in 1821 and 1836 respectively. Though the game described does incorporate a score for making no tricks, it is of an antiquated type; the account is in fact at almost all points a translation of that in *KH* (1783).

Three-handed Dutch Tarok (first half of nineteenth century)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Taroks*. The XXI is called *Mongue*, the I is called *Pagato* (*KG*) or *Pagat* (*NB*), and the Fool *Scus* (*KG*) or *Skus* (*NB*); these three cards are called collectively *Honneurs*.

Rules of play

All is as in the first version set out in this chapter, as described in *KH* (1783), with the following exceptions. In the black suits the cards rank as in the red ones, that is, in every suit the cards rank:

K, Q, C, J, A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

It is presented as optional to recognise seven Kings and allow a leaping Skus (there is no declaration of Kings if seven Kings are not recognised); as in *KH*, Matadors from below are mentioned, as an option, but not explained. If it is chosen to attach the same penalties and bonus to the Kings as to the Pagat, then, as in *KH*, 30 game points are awarded for winning the last two tricks with the Mongue and the Pagat; but, whereas in *KH* the Pagat was required to be played to the penultimate trick, in *KG* they may be played in either order, and in *NB* the Pagat is required to be played last.

In Denmark, where 78-card French-suited packs were manufactured at least up to the First World War, the game was considerably more developed. Of four nineteenth-century Danish accounts I have seen, the earliest is *Anviisning til at Spille L'Hombre, Whist, Boston og Tarock* by Sp. M. Basta, published in Copenhagen in 1846. Since the game it describes does not fall into any of the categories so far distinguished, it is best to set it out in full.

Danish Tarock (mid-nineteenth century)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Tarockker*, the XXI the *Manyue* or more usually the 21, the I is called the *Pagat* and the Fool the *Scues* or *Excuse*. The discard is called the *Scatt*.

Deal and discard

There are three players. A 78-card French-suited pack is used. Deal and play are *clockwise*. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in five rounds of five each; he takes the last three cards for himself, and discards three, which count to him at the end of the round. He may never discard Kings or the XXI. If he has the Pagat and just two other Tarockker, not including the XXI, or the Pagat, just one other Tarock, which is not the XXI, and the Scues, he may if he wishes discard these three cards: in no other case may he discard a Tarock. It is always lawful to discard the Scues.

Declarations

When the dealer has discarded, the player to his left makes the first declaration, followed by the other two in turn. Declared cards must be shown to the other players. Possible declarations are:

Ten or more Tarockker – 10 + 5 game points.

A Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A half or *scueseret* Cavallerie (any three court cards of one suit with the Scues) – 5 game points.

All four Kings – 10 game points.
All four Kings with the Scues – 20 game points.
Three (natural) Kings with the Scues – 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above) – 10 + 5 game points.

Each player making a declaration is paid its value by each of the other two players.

Play

When the declarations are completed, the player to the left of the dealer leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out according to the usual rules. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order. The Scues serves as Excuse, and is replaced by a low card as soon as possible, but is lost if played to any of the last three tricks. The Scues may be led to a trick; the player leading it names any suit, either Tarockker or a plain suit, and the other players have to play a card of that suit; presumably this may be done only when at least one player has a card of the suit named.

Bonuses and penalties

A player who wins a trick with the Pagat is paid 5 game points by each of the other players, or 15 game points if it is the last trick. One who wins the last trick with a King is paid 10 game points by each of the other two. One who loses the Pagat in the last trick pays 15 game points to each of the other players; one who loses a King in the last trick pays 10 game points to each of them. One who loses either the Pagat or a King in an earlier trick pays 5 game points to each of the other two. Under another manner of play, however, the bonus or penalty for a King ultimo is valued at 30 game points, that for Pagat ultimo at 40 game points.

Scoring

At the end of the round, the players reckon their points on cards won in tricks, counting in threes, with the counting cards having their standard values. A player who has more than 26 points receives, in all, as many game points as he has points above 26, one who has less than 26 points pays, in all, as many game points as he has points below 26. If, however, a player has made *Misère*, that is, has won no tricks at all, the points on the cards no longer signify: the *Misère* player is awarded 26 game points by each of the other two players. However, the payments for declarations and the bonuses and penalties for bringing home or losing the Pagat or a King, including those for Pagat or King ultimo, apply as usual in the case of a *Misère*. It is tacitly assumed (though not explicitly stated) that only one player can make a *Misère* in any round. According to a new manner of play, a player making a *Misère* is awarded 52 game points by each of the other players, and, when a *Misère* is made, there is no payment for a Pagat or King ultimo (save, presumably, the usual 5 game points as in an earlier trick). It is unclear whether this new manner of play is to be associated with the high scores of 30 and 40 game points for King and Pagat ultimo, or whether these are independent variations.

This version of the game is intermediate between the 1800 and 1820 German versions: there is no mention of the seven Kings recognised in the former, nor of the announcements of *Misère* and slam characteristic of the latter: the text, which contains some advice on tactics, pays equal attention to *Misère* and ultimo. The *Nyeste Dansk Spillebog* by S.A. Jorgensen, published in Copenhagen in 1868, also has a section devoted to Taroc. This is, however, merely a translation from German sources, with some mistakes made in the process, suggesting that the author may not have been personally acquainted with the game. The description of the three-handed game is taken from the 1800 version, and the section includes also the four-handed Viennese/Lombard game and the two-handed game, both described in the last chapter, as well as Tarok l'Hombre and Tarok-Quadrille, to be described in Chapter 14. At best, this work serves only to indicate that all these forms were known in Denmark in the nineteenth century, and even this is open to doubt. A very well-informed account, dealing only with the three-handed game, and that in a far more developed version than the one described in the *Anviisning*, is given in a short anonymous and undated book on the game simply called *Tarok*; it cites the German name *Gross-Tarok* for the game, and is probably to be assigned to the 1870s or the 1880s. This work is the only one known to me that attempts a comprehensive survey of all the variant rules observed in the play of Grosstarock, and is therefore of great interest. Despite occasional allusions to modes of play current in Germany, the survey is restricted to Denmark, with many remarks of the form 'In some places they play ...'; it thus testifies to the widespread popularity of the game in Denmark at the time the book was written, and, as always, with Tarot games, the very local character of the various modes of play.

Danish Tarok (late nineteenth century)

Terminology

Trumps are called *Tarokker*, the XXI is called *Mondo*, the I *Pagat* and the Fool *Scus*. The discard is called the *Scat*.

Deal and discard

There are three players, and a 78-card French-suited pack is used. Deal and play are anti-clockwise. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each, in five rounds of five each, and takes the last three cards for himself. He discards three, which count to him at the end of the round. He may never discard Kings or the Mondo. He may not normally discard the Scus, but may do so when he aims to make a slam. (This rule could obviously not be very strictly enforced, and would not need to be.) If the dealer has three or fewer Tarokker, including the Pagat, he may discard them; in no other case may he discard Tarokker. The other players are entitled to enquire whether he has discarded Tarokker, and, if so, how many.

Variant rule on discard

The dealer may discard Tarokker only if he has exactly three (among which is the Pagat but not the Mondo).

Declarations

After he has discarded, the dealer makes any declarations he wishes to, followed by the others in turn. The possible declarations are:

Ten or more Tarokker (possibly including the Scus) – 10 + 5 game points.

A Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A half Cavallerie (any three court cards of one suit with the Scus) – 5 game points.

All four Kings – 10 game points.
Three Kings and the Scus – 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above) – 10 + 5 game points.

When ten or more Tarokker are declared, they must be shown to the other players. Other declared cards need not be shown, but the effect is the same, since the suit of a Cavallerie must always be stated, the missing card named when a half Cavallerie is declared, and the missing King named when three Kings and the Scus are declared. For each declaration, a player is paid its value by each of the other two players.

Variant rules governing declarations

(a) When ten or more Tarokker are declared, they need not be shown, but it must be stated whether or not the Scus and the Pagat are included. This variation is frequently observed.

(b) Matadors may be reckoned from below, without the Mondo, as well as from above: the Pagat, Scus and II constitute the first three Matadors from below. One may combine Matadors from below with the Matadors from above. It is not quite clear whether these form two distinct declarations or only a single one: probably the latter.

(c) A leaping Scus may be used in Matador declarations to fill more than one gap, so long as they are not consecutive, and the last member of the sequence is actually present. The example given is the set comprising the Pagat, Scus, Mondo, XIX, XVII and XV, forming *nine* Matadors.

(d) To the Cavallerie declarations is added that of a 'full' Cavallerie, consisting of all four court cards of one suit and the Scus, with a value of 15 game points.

(e) The following system is used for Cavallerie declarations:

A complete Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
A complete Cavallerie with the Scus – 20 game points.
A half Cavallerie (any three court cards of one suit) – 5 game points.
A half Cavallerie with the Scus – 10 game points.

(f) If a previous player has declared a complete Cavallerie, a subsequent player may declare a half Cavallerie only if the missing card is either the King or the Jack.

(g) A declaration of a half Cavallerie is allowed only to a player holding at least three Kings.

(h) It is not required that one state the suit of a Cavallerie, the missing card of a half Cavallerie or the missing King in a declaration of three Kings with the Scus.

(i) To the declarations of Kings is added that of four Kings with the Scus, valued at 15 game points.

(j) Seven Kings are recognised. A declaration of three or more Kings (out of seven), valued at 5 + 5 game points, then replaces the usual declarations of Kings.

(k) One may make a declaration of four Queens, of four *Cavaller* or of four Jacks, with a value of 5 game points, or of any of these accompanied by the Scus, with a value of 10 game points.

(l) One may declare sixteen or more Ladons, possibly including the Scus, with a value of 10 + 5 game points.

Play

The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out in accordance with the usual rules. The Scus serves as Excuse. When it is played, a low card is given in exchange for it from among the cards won in tricks (not from the Scat); it is not expressly stated that one may do this later if one cannot do it immediately, but this is probably so. The Scus may be led to a trick: the player names a suit, either Tarokker or a plain suit, which the other players must follow if they can; the Scus is then as usual taken back and replaced by a low card won in a previous trick. It is expressly stated that a suit must be chosen in which there are still some cards in the other players' hands; presumably it is sufficient that there should be a card of the suit in the hand of *one* of the players, though this is not made clear. If the player leading the Scus makes a mistake, and names a suit in which the others are void, the player to his right is entitled to name the suit instead. The Scus is lost if it is played to either of the last *two* tricks.

Variant rule governing the Scus

The Scus is lost if played to any of the last *three* tricks. This rule is expressly said to be observed by some Danish players. It is stated that in Germany the usual rule is that the Scus is lost if played to any of the last *four* tricks; but there is no confirmation of this from any German source.

Bonuses and penalties

One who loses the Pagat pays 5 game points to each of the other players, or 15 game points if he loses it in the last trick. One who loses a King pays 5 game points to each of the other players, or 10 game points if he loses it in the last trick. A player who wins a trick with the Pagat is paid 5 game points by each of the other two, or 15 game points if it is the last trick. One who wins the last trick with a King is paid 10 game points by each of the other players. There is no bonus for winning an earlier trick with a King, unless one wins both the last two tricks with Kings, in which case one is paid 15 game points in all by each of the other players, or wins each of the last three tricks with Kings, when one is paid 20 game points in all by each of the other players. If the Pagat and all four Kings have been played before the last trick, the winner of the last trick is paid 5 game points by each of the other players.

There are two ultimo pots, one for Pagat ultimo and one for King ultimo: these provide bonuses and penalties in addition to those just stated. At the beginning of play each player puts 20 game points into the Pagat pot and 5 into the King pot; and they do the same whenever a pot is emptied. Before each deal, the dealer puts 5 game points into each pot. If a player loses the Pagat in the last trick, he doubles whatever is in the Pagat pot; if he loses it in an earlier trick, he pays 5 game points to the Pagat pot. If a player wins the last trick with the Pagat, he takes the entire contents of the Pagat pot. If a player loses a King in the last trick, he doubles the King pot; if he wins the last trick with a King, he takes the contents of the King pot.

Variant rule governing ultimo

There are no ultimo pots, but the bonus or penalty for Pagat ultimo is increased to 30 game points from or to each of the other players, and that for King ultimo to 25 game points.

Scoring and announcements

At the end of the round, each player reckons his points on the cards he has won in tricks, counting in threes and assigning to the counting cards their standard values. If each has made at least one trick, any player who has made more than 26 points receives, in all, as many game points as he has points above 26, and any who has made less than 26 points pays, in all, as many game points as he has points below 26.

If a player has made *Nolo*, i.e. has taken no tricks, each of the others having taken at least one, then, if he did not announce it, he receives 26 game points from each of the other players. Of the other two players, one who has less than 39 points pays to the other as many game points as he has points below 39. Further, the bonus or penalty for Pagat or King ultimo remains in force, but only between the two players who have taken tricks, one paying the other 15 or 10 game points. *Nolo* may be announced before the first or the thirteenth trick. If an announced *Nolo* is made, the other two players settle between themselves, as before, for points on cards and Pagat or King ultimo, and each pays the *Nolo* player 36 game points if he announced before the first trick, and 31 game points if he announced before the thirteenth trick. If an announced *Nolo* fails, the three players settle as usual for points on cards and for bonuses and penalties for the Pagat and Kings; in addition, the player who attempted the *Nolo* pays 10 game points to each of the other two if he announced before the first trick, and 5 if before the thirteenth.

When there are ultimo pots, it is usual to add a further premium, in addition to those just stated, for *Nolo*. For a successful unannounced *Nolo*, each of the other two players pays a further 15 game points. If *Nolo* is announced before the thirteenth trick, the *Nolo* player receives from or pays to each of the other players an additional 25 game points; if it is announced before the first trick, he receives from or pays to each an additional 50 game points.

Many players admit announcements for *Volo* or *Tout*, that is, for making all the tricks. A player who makes an unannounced *Volo* is paid 26 game points by each of the other two players. *Volo* may be announced before the first, the thirteenth or the twentieth trick. If an announced *Volo* succeeds, the other two players pay 52 game points each if it was announced before the first trick, 38 game points each if before the thirteenth, and 31 game points if before the twentieth. If an announced *Volo* fails, the player who attempted

Volo pays the same amounts to each of the other two players; but settlement is also made for points on cards in the usual way. If there are ultimo pots a player who makes *Volo*, announced or unannounced, takes the contents of both pots in addition to the foregoing payment. If the game is not being played with ultimo pots, it is usual to attach a high additional premium to *Volo*.

The picture given in this small book, of a game played with numerous local variations, serves as a corrective to the probably misleading impression given by the German card-game books of two distinct traditions.

Two more Danish accounts testify to the persistence of Tarok in Denmark into the twentieth century: *Tarok*, by Emil Wolff, Copenhagen, 1899, and *Tarok: Vejledning og Regler for Spillet*, by J.V.V. Hermansen, Copenhagen, 1926. These works describe a game not basically different from that set out in the foregoing account, but sufficiently distinctive to warrant a separate description. In this later form of Danish Tarok, announcements of Nolo and of Tout (slam) have been finally suppressed. The game certainly continued to be played in Denmark through the Second World War, because Danish players, unable at that time to obtain Tarock cards from elsewhere, produced their own hand-made cards, which bore only letters and numerals to indicate rank and suit. It is reliably reported that a small circle of Tarok players continues to survive in Copenhagen, and this has now been definitely confirmed. Almost certainly the game they play is identical with that described in the two works cited above.

Danish Tarok (twentieth century)

Deal and discard

As in the preceding form, there are three players, and a 78-card French-suited pack is used. Deal and play are anti-clockwise. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in five rounds of five at a time, beginning with the player to his right, and, in the last round of the deal, takes all the last eight cards for himself. He then discards three cards, which count to him at the end of the round. According to Hermansen, a player who receives no Tarokker may demand a re-deal; the Skus does not count as a Tarok for this purpose. The dealer may never discard a King or the Mondo. He may discard Tarokker only if he has three or fewer of them, whether or not these include the Pagat, and only if he then discards all he has (of course, the Mondo may not be one of them); again, the Skus does not count for this purpose as a Tarok. He may discard the Skus only if he intends to attempt to make Tout (win all the tricks). Hermansen states that he must, in this case, announce that he has discarded the Skus, thus revealing that he is attempting Tout; note that this does not increase his score for Tout, if he makes it, or render him subject to any special penalty if he does not.

Declarations

These take place before the lead is made to the first trick: the dealer makes his declaration as soon as he has completed his discard, and the other two players then do the same in turn. All allowable declarations are obligatory. The usual declarations are as follows:

Ten or more Tarokker – 10 + 5 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above) – 10 + 5 game points.

Full Kavalleri (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.
Half Kavalleri (any three court cards of one suit with the Skus) – 5 game points.
Sprøjtefuldt ('pump-full') Kavalleri (all four court cards of one suit with the Skus) – 15 game points.

Full Kings (all four Kings) – 10 game points.
Half Kings (any three Kings with the Skus) – 5 game points.
Sprøjtefuldt Kings (all four Kings with the Skus) – 15 game points.

The payments are those made to the player making the declaration by each of the other two players. A player does not have to show the cards he is declaring, but, in declaring a Kavalleri, he must state its suit, and, in declaring a half Kavalleri or half Kings, he must say which card is missing. In declaring ten or more Tarokker, the player must state 'with' or 'without' (*med* or *uden*), to show whether or not the Pagat is included; he does not further identify his Tarokker. For the purpose of a declaration of ten or more Tarokker, the Skus counts as a Tarok.

Variant rules on declarations

Hermansen, writing in 1926, cites no variant types of declaration; probably the game had assumed, by that date, a completely standardised form, and perhaps was little played outside Copenhagen. Wolff, writing in 1899, gives the above declarations as the standard ones, but mentions almost all the variants familiar from other sources. His book is full of remarks to the effect that, in some places, such-

and-such a rule is observed, showing that, when he was writing, the game was still widely played, with local variations.

The variants mentioned by Wolff are as follows:

(i) Some players require the ten or more Tarokker to be shown.

(ii) Some admit Matadors from below, without the Mondo. In this case, it is legitimate to declare Matadors from above and below simultaneously, without specifying more than the total number of Matadors.

(iii) Some require a half Kavalleri to include the King.

(iv) Some admit a leaping Skus in Matador declarations: in this case, the Skus may be used to fill any number of non-adjacent gaps, and the number of Matadors declared is the total of cards there would be if the gaps were filled by the actual cards; e.g. the Skus, Mondo, Pagat, 19, 17 and 15 count as *nine* Matadors (the three principal ones plus the six from the 20 to 15 inclusive). When a leaping Skus is admitted, it is also lawful to declare a half Kavalleri of any three court cards in one suit *without* the Skus; the addition of the Skus then doubles its value. (This system is like variant (e) in the preceding game.)

(v) Some allow a declaration of sixteen or more Ladons, the Skus counting for this purpose as a Ladon.

(vi) Some recognise seven Kings. In this case, it is possible to declare up to seven of them (whether the minimum such declaration is of three or four Kings is left unspecified).

(vii) Some allow declarations of four Queens, four Kavaller or four Jacks.

Play

The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out in accordance with the usual rules. The suit cards rank in their original order, and the Skus serves as Excuse. If played to any trick up to and including the twenty-third (the last trick but two), the Skus is taken back by the player who had it, and placed among the cards he has won in tricks, from which he gives a low card in exchange for it (he may not give such a card from the Skat). Wolff states that in Germany the Skus may be retained only if played no later than the twenty-first trick (the last trick but four); some players in Denmark allow it to be retained only up to the twenty-second trick (the last but three). Hermansen does not mention these variations.

The Skus may be led to a trick. If led to any trick other than the last, the player leading it may name a suit, either a plain suit or Tarokker; the other two players must then play as if a card of that suit had been led. The suit named must, however, be one in which at least one of the other two players holds at least one card. If, by mistake, the player leading the Skus names a suit in which both the other players are void, the second player acquires the right to rename the suit in which the trick is to be played. If he fails to do so, the third player acquires that right; if necessary, the second player must then take back the card he played and substitute another (of the suit named by the third player). Hermansen provides, however, that, if the second player cannot follow to the suit named by the player who led the Skus, he may safeguard his right to name the suit by saying 'I cannot follow suit'; if the third player then says the same, the second player renames the suit. Hermansen also stipulates that, if the player leading the Skus names a suit in which both the other players are void, he pays a penalty, placing 20 game points in each of the two pots (see below).

Wolff states that some players require that, if the Skus has not been played before the twenty-third trick, it is unconditionally necessary for the player who holds it to play it to that trick. This variation is not mentioned by Hermansen, who agrees with Wolff about the usual practice. This is that, if the Skus has not been played before the twenty-third trick, either of the two players who do not hold the Skus may demand that it be played to that trick. The demand may be made by the player who leads to the trick. If the player with the lead neither leads nor demands the Skus, the second player may demand it at his turn to play. If, then, the Skus is held by the player who led to the trick, he must substitute it for the card he led: he then loses the right to name a suit, and the suit is named by the second player. If the third player holds the Skus, he must of course play it if it was demanded by the first or second player. If he does not, and it has not been played or demanded by either of the two, he may demand it at his turn to play. In this case, the player who held it must substitute it for the card he played; if it was held by the first player, the third player names the suit, and, if necessary, the second player substitutes an appropriate card for the one he played. If the Skus is not demanded at the twenty-third trick, and has not been previously played, it may be retained in the hand of the player who holds it, if he so chooses. In no case is it permissible to play the Skus to the last trick but one. If it is played to the last trick, it is captured by the player who wins that trick; if it is led to the last trick, the second player has the right to name the suit in which that trick is played, which will, of course, be the suit of his last card. Hermansen rules that someone who demands the Skus in the twenty-third trick, when it has in fact been played to an earlier one, pays a fine of 20 game points into each of the two pots.

It may be worth while to retain the Skus until the last trick in order to prevent another player's making an ultimo. Here is an example given by Hermansen. A, who has the lead to the twenty-third trick, has the

Pagat and two Spades; B has the Mondo, the Skus and a Heart; C has three Diamonds. A leads a Spade; if the Skus is not demanded, B takes the trick with the Mondo and leads his Heart, forcing A to play the Pagat. A should demand the Skus, and will then make Pagat ultimo.

Bonuses and penalties

There are two pots, one for Pagat ultimo and one for King ultimo. Each player contributes 20 game points to each pot before the start of play, or whenever it is empty. Before each deal, the dealer contributes 5 game points to either pot, provided that it is not empty.

A player who wins any trick other than the last with the Pagat receives 5 game points immediately from each of the other two players. One who loses the Pagat in any trick before the last pays 5 game points to each of the other two players, and puts 5 game points in the Pagat pot. One who loses a King in a trick other than the last pays 5 game points to each of the other two players and puts 5 game points in the King pot. One who wins the last trick with the Pagat receives 45 game points from each of the other two players, and takes the contents of the Pagat pot. One who loses the Pagat in the last trick pays 45 game points to each of the other two players, and doubles the contents of the Pagat pot. One who wins the last trick with a King receives 40 game points from each of the other two players, and takes the contents of the King pot. One who loses a King in the last trick pays 40 game points to each of the other two players, and doubles the contents of the King pot. According to Hermansen, if a player makes King ultimo, and another player plays a King to the last trick, the latter player doubles the King pot before the player making the ultimo takes it. If the last trick contains neither the Pagat nor a King, the player who wins it receives 10 game points from each of the other two according to Wolff, 20 according to Hermansen. (Wolff mentions also the alternative of having no ultimo pots, and setting the values of Pagat and King ultimo (won or lost) at only 15 and 10 game points, respectively from or to each of the other players.)

Score for cards

If each of the three players makes at least one trick, each reckons up the point-totals on the cards he has won in tricks. He counts 1 point for each set of three cards, together with 4 points for the Mondo, the Pagat, the Skus or a King, 3 points for a Queen, 2 points for a Kavall and 1 point for a Jack. (The reckoning of card points has thus reverted to the original method, yielding the usual total of 78 points for when the cards are counted in threes.) Each player receives, in all, as many game points as he has card points in excess of 26, or pays, in all, as many as he has below 26.

If just one of the players wins no tricks at all, he makes Nolo; in this case, points on cards are disregarded, and the Nolo player receives 26 game points from each of the other two players, who make no payment between themselves. Wolff mentions the former practice of announcing Nolo, with an extra premium for such an announcement, but says that it has quite gone out of use. He also remarks that Nolo was formerly the highest-scoring game after Tout, but that, with the introduction of the ultimo pots, and the high premiums for ultimo, that is no longer so; according to him, a player who made an unannounced Nolo formerly received the same bonus as for an ultimo, in addition to the 26 game points, but now is paid only the flat rate of 26 game points without any additional bonus. If a Nolo is made, there is no bonus for Pagat or King ultimo, or for winning the last trick. Furthermore, according to Wolff, if by the twenty-third trick just one of the players has so far made no tricks, it is not allowed to demand that the Skus be played to that trick. Payments for bringing home the Pagat, or losing the Pagat or a King, before the last trick remain in force in a Nolo; Wolff rules that the same holds for the penalty for losing the Pagat or a King in the last trick, though he mentions with disapproval the practice of exempting the Nolo player from this penalty.

If a player makes Tout (wins all the tricks), points on cards are again disregarded. He scores as if he had made both Pagat and King ultimo: each of the other two players pays him 85 game points, and he takes the contents of both pots. There is no additional payment for ultimo, if made, or for the last trick. Again, there are no announcements of Tout in advance.

This Danish game is the only living descendant of the once widely played version of three-handed Tarock with 78 cards originally developed in Germany. The Danish game, in its later form, represents one particular evolutionary path, which is in many respects a return to earlier models: the announcements of Tout and Nolo have been suppressed, and even unannounced Nolo has a diminished importance, the greater part of the interest of the game lying in the achievement or prevention of Pagat or King ultimo. It is fortunate that the tenacity of tradition in Denmark has preserved this type of Tarot game from the extinction that has overtaken certain others, such as Minchiate, to be described in Part III. The remarkable fact is, however, that there seem to be very few types of Tarot game that have no representative played somewhere still; not many of the chapters of this book devoted to accounts of games contain only games that are no longer played.

Although Grosstarock is still described in some modern German card-game books, it probably did not survive the First World War in Germany. The only Tarot game still played there is Cego, a game of an entirely different type played with the shortened 54-card pack, which will be described in Part IV. In Belgium and the Netherlands the game of Tarot, in any form, has long died out altogether. Yet Grosstarock, although it perhaps never achieved a definitive form, is one of the great games of the Tarot family, and, by its emphasis on bonuses for special feats accomplished during play, and its introduction of announcements of the intention to accomplish certain of them, made a profound contribution to the development of Tarot play. It would be a mistake to regard the declarations as merely importing a large element of luck into the scoring. They did do this; but they also served another purpose. A card game is essentially a game of imperfect information: but, if the information is too sparse, strategy is necessarily rudimentary. One of the reasons for the great success of Bridge, indeed what distinguishes Bridge, in all its forms, from the rest of the Whist family to which it belongs, was the introduction of the dummy, as a result of which, in every round, each of the active players knows for certain the whereabouts of twenty-six of the fifty-two cards. The declarations in Grosstarock to some extent fulfilled the same function, namely as helping to place the cards that one's opponents held; even when the declared cards were not shown, inspection of one's hand could often yield inferences, not only about those held by the player making a declaration, but also about those held by the third player. Unlike Bridge, however, Grosstarock exhibited a characteristic that was to become even more marked in many later Tarot games, the existence of diverse objectives. A player had, in the light of the declarations and his own holding, to make a choice of priorities, for instance, whether to conentrate first upon forcing an opponent with a weak hand to take a trick, upon capturing the Pagat or upon making a King ultimo; and it was this feature which gave the game its subtlety.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Tarocco in Piedmont and Lombardy

It was explained in Chapter 8 that, from the beginning of the eighteenth century, cardmakers in Lyons were exporting to Savoy 78-card Tarot packs in a pattern only very slightly modified from the Tarot de Marseille, with French inscriptions on the trumps and court cards; that in about 1735 Piedmontese cardmakers started to produce precisely similar packs, still with French inscriptions; and that this pattern was the ancestor, through one intervening stage, of the modern Tarocco Piemontese, the inscriptions being translated into Italian at the intermediate stage. It was also explained that only a little later, in the 1740s, cardmakers in several other Italian cities, particularly in Bologna, which did a brisk export trade in playing cards to other parts of Italy, began producing 78-card packs in a distinct pattern, also very close to the Tarot de Marseille, and also with French inscriptions. This we called the 'Lombard pattern', because the evidence indicates that, within Italy, it was used only in Lombardy; in the nineteenth century the pattern was produced by Milanese cardmakers, now with Italian inscriptions replacing the French ones, but has since died out, superseded, everywhere in Italy that the 78-card pack is used, by the Tarocco Piemontese. It was argued that the introduction of these two patterns, embodying the hitherto un-Italian practice of putting names on the trumps and court cards, and moreover at first doing so in the French language, must represent the reintroduction of the game of Tarocco from France into regions where it had formerly been played but had died out. Since, by the end of the seventeenth century, the 78-card pack was probably no longer in use in Florence or Rome, and had long been forgotten in Bologna, it was very likely obsolete everywhere in mainland Italy before the introduction of the Tarot de Marseille-derived patterns. At any rate, by 1739 we have travellers' reports of Tarocco being played in Turin, and by the 1760s reports of its popularity both in Piedmont and in Lombardy.[1] The style of play in these two regions was significantly different; in Piedmont a large number of different forms were known, in Lombardy there was no such variety. I shall begin by describing the Piedmontese forms.

The only actual account of these games known to me is the *Primi Elementi e Regole del Giuoco de' Tarocchi* (*PE*) published in Turin in 1787. Some further information is provided by a book by Carlo O..., published in Turin in 1830, called *Regole inalterabili per tutti i giuochi di Tarocco detti di commèrcio* (*RI*). This, however, does not describe the games, but takes them as known: it is a collection of laws governing penalties for a misdeal (called a *giuoco fallo*), a revoke and other misdemeanours. It is, however, possible to glean some substantive information from it, by way of direct statement or of implication.

---

[1] See *The Letters of Thomas Gray chronologically arranged from the Walpole and Mason Collections*, vol. I, London, 1827, p. 54; Gray, writing from Turin on 16 November 1739, speaks of having seen taroc played there. De La Lande, *Voyage d'un François en Italie fait dans les années 1765 & 1766*, vol. I, Venice and Paris, 1769, p. 217, refers to 'les *Tarocchi*, espece de cartes particulieres' as being made in Turin. Joseph Baretti, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of Italy*, vol. II, London, 1768, pp. 219-21, speaks of the game of Tarocco as in vogue in Piedmont and Lombardy, and says of it and of Minchiate: 'Both games may be played by only two, or only three people in several ways; but the most ingenious as well as the most in use are two or three games that are played by four people; and more especially one which is played by one against three, much after the ruling principle of ombre, and another played two against two, not unlike whist.'

General rules and terminology of Piedmontese Tarot games

In *PE* the generic word for trumps is *trionfi*, but in *RI* the word *tarocchi* is used in this sense. The usual term *Bagatto* is used for the lowest trump, the I. The Fool is called the *Folle* instead of the *Matto*, and a Queen is called a *Donna* rather than a *Regina*. The XX is called the *Angelo* (Angel = Judgment). Other names for particular trumps worth noting are: XXI – *Mondo* (World); XVII – *le Stelle* (the Stars); XVI – *Casa* (House = Tower); XII – *l'Appicato* (the Hanged Man); XI – *la Forza* (Force = Fortitude); IX – *Eremita* (Hermit); and VI – *l'Amore* (Love). The *Angelo*, Bagatto, Folle and the four Kings are called collectively 'honours' (*onori*).

The suit cards are always ranked in their original order. The order of the trumps is peculiar to the Piedmontese games: the XX or *Angelo* is highest, followed by the XXI or *Mondo*, then the XIX, XVIII and so on in numerical sequence down to the I or Bagatto. Save in Trentuno and Sedici, the values of the counting cards are as follows:

Angelo	5 points
Bagatto	5 points
Folle	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Cavallo	3 points
Each Jack	2 points

Thus the Angelo is a counting card, but the Mondo is not: in fact, the XX simply usurps the place of the XXI in the French, Swiss and German games.

Play and deal are counter-clockwise. Play to a trick is under the usual constraints. Except in Trentuno and Sedici, the Folle serves as Excuse: it is not actually played to the trick in which it is used, but is shown to the other players, and then put down on the pile of cards won in tricks by that player or side. At the end of the round, that player or side surrenders any one card of their choice to the player or side that won the trick in which the Folle was used; if they have won no tricks, they must surrender the Folle. The lead to the first trick is always by the player to the right of the dealer.

In games in which the dealer has to make a discard, he is never allowed to discard an honour (card counting 5 points). *RI* permits no exceptions to this; *PE* admits two. First, if the dealer has the Bagatto and neither the Folle nor any other trump, he may discard the Bagatto. Secondly, the Folle may be discarded in the case that the dealer believes that, without it, he can make a *vola* (slam), i.e. win all the tricks. It is not explained what happens if, having discarded the Folle, the dealer loses a trick; a suitable rule would be that, at the end of the round, he must surrender the Folle, in exchange for any one card of their choice, to the side or player who won the first trick from him. If the dealer or the dealer's side make no tricks at all, they must surrender the discarded cards to the player or side winning the last trick. As soon as the dealer has made his discard, he must say '*Ho scartato*' ('I have discarded') and play proceeds; he may not thereafter alter his discard.

In some games, the dealer has a certain latitude about the number of cards he is to distribute in each round of the deal. He must, however, announce, before he starts dealing, how many cards he will give in each round.

In all games in which the whole pack is dealt out, there is a pause after the first round of the deal to decide whether or not to continue it. If all the players, after looking at the cards so far dealt to them, agree to abandon the deal in favour of a new one by the next dealer, they can do so: this is called *andare al monte* (going to the mountain). A proposal to abandon the deal is expressed by saying '*A monte*'. – This was a general practice in many Italian card games from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

The term for a slam (winning all the tricks) is *vola*, and a *vola* usually carries an agreed bonus. The term *marcio*, which in some other games means 'slam', here means a win in which the opponents do not reach half the points needed for victory (or, according to an alternative convention sometimes observed, a third of those points); a *marcio* is paid double.

In Permesso games, and in four-handed games with fixed partnerships, other than Consiglio, many players were accustomed to use certain conventional signals to direct or instruct their partners. *PE* is severe on this practice, saying that, while badly educated people were not to be blamed for doing it, it was dishonourable in anyone well-bred. *RI*, however, allows certain signals as established by ancient custom. These signals, which are made when leading to a trick, are: to strike (*battere*) the table with one's hand, by which the partner is asked to take the trick if he can and lead the same suit; to pinch (*pizzicare*) the card, in order to show that the Bagatto is in danger of being lost; and a signal called 'going away' (*andar via*) or 'letting go' (*mollare*), which may have been performed by dropping the card on to the table from a height above it, which requested the partner to switch to another suit.

It was suggested in Chapter 8 that the curious inversion of the XX and XXI – the more curious in that there was no attempt to change the numerals on the cards in that form of pack which for many decades was used only in Piedmont – was probably due to there having been some players of the newly introduced game who remembered having played Tarocco in some indigenous form in their youth; in many Italian Tarot games the Angel ranked higher than the World, for example in Tarocchino and in Minchiate. The inversion was unknown in Lombardy.

Some of the descriptions in *PE* are rather inadequate, and I shall indicate uncertainties where they occur. Unfortunately, this applies particularly to some of the simpler forms, with which, nevertheless, it seems appropriate to start.

Three-handed Venticinque

This game figures in the list given at the beginning of *PE*, but, presumably through an oversight, is not then described in the text that follows. The laws governing it are given in *RI*; from these it is evident that one of the rules given in the slightly confused first section of *PE*, which attempts simultaneously to describe Sedici and to give general rules relating to all games, applies particularly to this one. Each of the three players receives twenty-five cards, and the dealer takes the last three cards and discards three; the deal is specified in *RI* to be in three rounds, the first of five cards each and the second and third of ten cards each. After each round of the deal, the players may go *a monte* if all agree. The discard is subject to the restriction stated in the *General rules*; *RI* allows the discard of three trumps, provided that they are all below the XVII, but specifically forbids the discard of the Bagatto; it is unclear what the motive for such a discard would be.

Each player plays for himself. The cards are counted in *threes*, so that there are 78 points altogether. A game (*partita*) consists of three rounds. In each round, each player records a score, positive or negative, equal to the difference between his point-total and 26, and keeps a cumulative total from round to round. The winner of the game is that player who, in the last round, is the first to attain a positive cumulative score. If, by the end of the last round, the other two players both have negative or zero scores, each pays the winner 1 game point; but if one of them has a positive score, he pays and receives nothing, and the third player pays the winner 2 game points. If, after the first two rounds, any player has a cumulative score of more than 26, he must have a positive score at the end of the third round, since he cannot lose more than 26 points; hence, when the cards have been dealt out, he announces 'Fuora' (Out), and becomes the winner of the game. The same applies as soon as, in the course of the last round, any player has won sufficiently many card points in the tricks he has taken to guarantee that he will have a positive final cumulative score. *PE* says that, as soon as a player has announced 'Fuora', he places his cards face down on the table, and takes no more part in the play; the other two players continue the round, in order to determine whether one or both will pay. (It would seem reasonable that, in this case, the cards won after the winner has gone out should be counted in twos, but nothing is said about this.) *PE* adds, however, that the winner may continue to play, unloading counting cards on the tricks of one of the two players to help him attain a positive score; the author regards this as an ungentlemanly act (*atto poco grazioso*). *RI*, however, requires him to continue playing, but *da fuori* (from outside). This apparently means that his cards are deprived of trick-taking power; it is unclear whether or not he remains subject to the usual constraints of following suit and of playing a trump. In any case, he is obliged to try to throw counting cards to that one of the other two players who has, at that moment, the lower cumulative total, and is penalised for failing to do this.[2]

Three-handed Partita

This game is not mentioned in *RI*. The deal and discard are as in Venticinque. Each plays for himself, but all play on until the end of each round. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in *twos*; there are 91 points altogether, and an odd low card counts $\frac{1}{2}$ point. The player who gains the highest number of points, even by $\frac{1}{2}$ point, is paid by both opponents; apparently the payment is fixed, and does not vary with the points gained.

---

[2] The passage in *RI* which I have interpreted as meaning that a player who has gone out plays on, his cards being deprived of the power to win a trick, but as leaving it uncertain whether he remains subject to the usual constraints in play, runs as follows: 'Quando uno dei giuocatori sarà giunto a quel termine di vincita che non può più perdere la partita, cioè avrà nell'ultima distribuzione più di ventisei punti di guadagno, sarà obbligato a giuocare, come si dice, *da fuori*; cioè tutte le sue carte *firme* senza più tirarne alcun partito sulle inferiori, e quindi dovendo perderle le darà a quello dei giuocatori che imparzialmente occorrerà. Contravvenendo a tale obbligo pagherà l'onoranza di cinque punti per volta a caduno dei due avversari', this *onoranza* being equal to what in the text I have designated 1 game point.

Partita

Four players take part; they form two fixed partnerships of two each, partners facing each other across the table. (Partnerships are determined by each player drawing one card from the pack; those drawing the two highest cards play together, and the one drawing the highest card becomes the first dealer.) The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player; the method of dealing is not stated. The dealer gives himself the two last cards, and discards two, under the usual restrictions; *RI* imposes the same rule as in Venticinque. The cards won in tricks by each side are counted in *fours* at the end of the round, making 72 points altogether; presumably the two cards of the discard count as if there were four of them (i.e. two odd low cards count 1 point), though this is not explicitly stated. *PE* states that some prefer to count the cards in twos, in which case there are 91 points altogether. Play is as usual. The winning side receives an *onoranza* of 10 game points: if both sides have 36 points, neither pays. Presumably the *onoranza* is doubled for a *marcio* (when the losing side has not attained 18 points), and trebled for a *vola* (when the winners have taken all the tricks). There is no mention of any further payment, but it would be possible to reckon 1 additional game point for every 5 points the winners have above 36.

Two-handed Venticinque

The dealer gives twenty-five cards to his opponent and twenty-eight to himself, taking three more cards than his opponent on the last round of the deal; the method of dealing is left unstated. The dealer discards three cards under the usual restrictions, and when he has said *'Io ho scartato'*, the opponent leads to the first trick. Play is as usual, and, at the end of the round, each counts his cards in *twos*: the player who has the highest number of points wins the game. Players must agree in advance what special payment shall be made for a *marcio*, i.e. for the winner's having more than twice as many points as the loser, and for a *vola*, i.e. for winning all the tricks; there may also be a special bonus for a *triplice*, i.e. for having more than three times as many points as the opponent, and for a *quadriplice*, i.e. for having more than four times as many points. (E.g. there could be 1 game point for a simple win, 2 game points for a *marcio*, 3 for a *triplice*, 4 for a *quadriplice* and 6 for a *vola*.) This game is mentioned only in *PE*.

Morto

This is another two-handed game, exactly like two-handed Venticinque, save that the twenty-five undealt cards are placed face down as a stock in the middle of the table. After each trick the winner of that trick takes the top card of the stock, shows it to his opponent, and then adds it to the cards he has won in tricks. In this way every card of the pack will by the end of the round belong to one or other of the two players, who will thus have 91 points between them, an odd low card counting ½ point. This game is also mentioned only in *PE*.

Baronetti

This is a two-handed game for children, an excellent way of teaching them Tarocchi by means of a game that is very easy to play, and has a large component of chance. The dealer gives ten cards to his opponent, one by one; the opponent does not pick them up, but they remain face down in a pile on the table in front of him, save that the dealer turns the top card of the pile face up. Next, the dealer deals himself a pile of ten cards, of which only the last (top) one is turned face up, in exactly the same way. He then deals two more piles of ten cards to each just as before, again turning up the top card only of each pile. Finally, he deals a pile of nine cards to his opponent, turning the top card, and a pile of nine cards to himself, again turning the top card. The two players now play according to the usual rules, the dealer's opponent leading to the first trick. A player may, at any time, play only one of the cards that are exposed at the top of one of his piles of cards. When both have played to a trick, each turns up the next card of the pile from which he played, unless, of course, he played the last card of any pile. The obligations to follow suit if one can and, when one cannot, to play a trump if one can hold as usual, but, of course, only in respect of the exposed cards. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in twos, and the player with the higher number of points is the winner. This is another game mentioned only in *PE*.

The next game, Mitigati, is the Piedmontese version of the classic three-handed game described in Chapter 11.

Three-handed Mitigati

The games known as Mitigati, also spelled Mittigati, are ones in which players score bonuses for combinations of cards held in hand and announced at the start of play. In the three-handed game, the dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, which he must do in three rounds; the first of five cards each, the second and third of ten cards each. The dealer takes the last three cards himself and discards three. According to *RI*, not only may he not discard honours, but he may not discard trumps either.

The declarations are to be made after the dealer discards and says '*Ho scartato*', but before the player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. There are three possible declarations: Mitigati, Honours and Trumps. A declaration of Mitigati means possession of the Angelo, Bagatto and Folle: it is worth 10 game points in itself. Honours may be declared by a player having three or more honours (i.e. the Angelo, Bagatto, Folle and the four Kings). Three honours are worth 10 game points; 5 game points are added for each honour above three. Four honours are thus worth 15 game points, but, if they include the Angelo, Bagatto and Folle, the player can declare Mitigati as well, worth another 10 game points; and if he has just the Angelo, Bagatto and Folle, he may declare both Mitigati and three honours, each worth 10 game points. Trumps may be declared by a player having ten or more: such a declaration is worth just as many game points as there are trumps. It is not expressly stated that, for this purpose, the Folle may be counted as a trump, but, in the absence of a statement to the contrary, that is the probable presumption. A player *must* make any declaration that he can, and there are penalties for failure to do so; he does not, however, show his cards, or specify their exact identity. A player making a declaration is paid its value in game points immediately, not at the conclusion of the round, by *each* of his opponents.

Play is as usual. The cards are counted in threes, making 78 points in all. If only one player makes 26 points or more, he is paid an *onoranza* of 10 game points by each of the opponents; if two players each make 26 points or more, the remaining player pays each of them 10 game points.

A player who wins the last trick with the Bagatto is paid 30 game points by each of the opponents. If he loses the Bagatto in the last trick, he pays 30 game points to each opponent. If he loses the Bagatto in any trick before the last one, he pays 5 game points to each opponent. There is no bonus for winning a trick, other than the last one, with the Bagatto.

PE notes that some players award 30 game points for a declaration of Mitigati, and that some award more or less than 10 game points for three honours.

RI envisages a possibility, not allowed for in *PE*, of announcing the *Bagatto ultimo*, that is, the intention to win the last trick with the Bagatto. Presumably this must be done, if at all, at the time when the declarations are made, after the discard and before the lead to the first trick. A player who makes such an announcement is not permitted to play his Bagatto until he is forced to. He gains 30 game points from each opponent if he succeeds, but pays each 30 game points if he fails, even if his Bagatto is not captured. In addition, there is a special pot, called *ghinghetta*, to which presumably all players contribute whenever it is empty, which is won by a player successfully making an announced Bagatto ultimo, and which must be doubled by a player announcing Bagatto ultimo and failing. A player who has announced Bagatto ultimo is not allowed, unless compelled to by having no other cards except the Bagatto, to lead any of the top five trumps. *RI* apparently envisages the possibility of a player's responding to an announcement of Bagatto ultimo by announcing the intention of capturing the Bagatto. A player who has announced this intention is not allowed, unless compelled, to lead a trump lower than the XVII. If he succeeds, the player who announced Bagatto ultimo pays him 60 game points, and nothing to the third player; if the player who announced Bagatto ultimo succeeds, he is paid 60 game points by the one who announced that he would capture the Bagatto. It is not clearly stated what happens in other cases; but it would be logical that, if the third player captures the Bagatto, both the other two pay him 30 game points each, while, if the player with the Bagatto wins a trick other than the last with it, he pays each of the other two 30 game points as usual.

Two-handed Mitigati with the Morto

This game is mentioned only in *RI*. It is apparently exactly the same as the game of Morto described above, save that the players may make the same declarations as in Mitigati, scoring for them in the same way, may score for winning the last trick with the Bagatto, and may perhaps also announce the intention of doing so. The dealer may discard neither honours nor trumps.

Two-handed Mitigati with a large discard

The description in *PE* is exceptionally vague, but the following reconstruction is probably correct. The dealer first gives twenty-five cards to his opponent, and twenty-six to himself. The opponent next discards twelve cards and the dealer discards thirteen, so that each has thirteen left. The dealer now gives twelve cards to his opponent and to himself, and also takes the last three cards for himself; he then discards three more cards. At the end of this process, each has twenty-five cards. Neither player may discard honours; *RI* adds that they may not discard trumps either, but this may occasionally be necessary.

As in three-handed Mitigati, declarations may be made before the play to the first trick, and there is the same bonus for winning the last trick with the Bagatto, and the same penalties for losing the Bagatto. It is unclear whether one may announce Bagatto ultimo. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in twos: all the discarded cards count to the player who discarded them. The winner is the player who makes 46 points or more. The probable interpretation of the scoring system, from indications given in *RI*, is as follows. The winner receives from the loser 10 game points, or 20 game points if the loser has not attained 23 card points, plus as many game points as the winner has above 46. If the winner has made *vola*, i.e. has taken all the tricks, then the loser must surrender to him all the cards he discarded, so that the winner has all 91 card points. He should then receive 65 game points, by the above system; but for *vola* the payment is doubled, so that he receives 130 game points.

Dottore

Five players take part, the dealer giving fifteen cards to each and taking the last three cards for himself, and then discarding three cards, which must not include honours. Each player plays for himself, not only in the game as a whole but in each round. Play is as usual. According to *PE*, the cards won in tricks are sometimes counted in threes, sometimes in twos, and sometimes singly; in the latter case, each counting card is given its full value and each low card counts 1 point, so that there are 130 points altogether. There is no information about the system of scoring. *RI* mentions declarations (*accusazioni*), presumably like those in Mitigati games; but, so far as appears, there is no bonus for winning the last trick with the Bagatto. *PE* seems not to envisage any declarations being made.

Consiglio

There are four players, divided into two fixed partnerships of two each. What differentiates this from other such games is that partners sit next to each other, preferably beside each other on a long side of a rectangular table, and may show each other their cards and freely consult one another in a low voice. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player, and takes the last two cards for himself, discarding two, which may not be honours, nor, according to *RI*, trumps. *RI* specifies that the deal shall be in four rounds, one, the first or the last, of four each and three of five each. According to *PE*, the cards are counted in twos, so that there are 91 points altogether. There are no bonuses, and a game consists of four rounds. Each side records its points for each round, whether it won or lost, and keeps a running total: the winners are those who make the most points in the course of the four rounds. *RI* describes the game rather differently, and its author waxes lyrical over the merits of the game. He apparently envisages the cards as being counted in fours (the two cards of the discard counting, as before, as a set of four), so that there are 72 points altogether. Each round is scored for separately, and the winning side receives as many game points as it won card points over 36. Though there are no declarations, there is an additional bonus of 30 game points for winning the last trick with the Bagatto. Presumably there is also a penalty of 30 game points for losing it in the last trick to the opponents, and perhaps also one of 5 game points for losing it in any other trick.

The next game introduces for the first time a feature that was to become of the very greatest importance in the history of Tarot, the use of a shortened 54-card pack. So far as we are able to say, the idea of such a shortened pack originated in Germany in about 1750. The practice never caught on at all in Switzerland, France or Belgium; it was only of minor importance in Italy, though it has not yet died out there. It does not appear to have been known to the author of *PE*, but figures in *RI*; we should therefore put its introduction into Piedmont at around 1800. Such a shortened pack was there known as a *mazzo castrato*: it was formed by omitting from each suit those six cards actually ranking lowest in the suit, the Ace to 6 in Swords and Batons and the 5 to 10 in Cups and Coins.

Consiglio Castrato

This game, mentioned only in *RI*, is exactly like ordinary Consiglio as described in *RI*, save for being played with a shortened 54-card pack, containing the Folle and the usual twenty-one trumps, and, in Swords and Batons, the K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, ranking in that order, and, in Cups and Coins, the K, Q, J, A, 2, 3, 4, ranking in that order. Each player receives thirteen cards, and the dealer gives himself the last two cards, discarding two. The cards are counted in fours, making 66 points in all; presumably the two odd cards belonging to the dealer and his partner count as four cards. Scoring is as in ordinary Consiglio, with the same bonus of 30 game points for winning the last trick with the Bagatto.

The next set of games to be described are the Permessi, which are of a type known elsewhere as

Tarocc'Ombre. Comparatively crude as they are, they represent a development of the very highest importance in the history of Tarot, namely the introduction of the idea of bidding. In Italy itself, this idea was not to find much favour; it was never much developed, and died out, probably in the course of the nineteenth century, except for the Bolognese game of Terziglio, still played there. In France, in Germany and, above all, in Austria and the other countries which once were part of the Empire, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia, it was refined to form the basis of a great many different games, including many of the most subtle and skilled of Tarot games.

We saw in Chapter 7 that the idea of bidding originated with the Spanish game of Tresillo, known elsewhere as Ombre or l'Hombre, a game that dates from the mid-sixteenth century. It was, in its time, the most successful card game ever invented, and the first of any to have elaborate treatises devoted to the strategy of the play. It underwent a rapid evolution, under which it became ever more complicated, particularly by the introduction of new forms of bid; and it spawned numerous variants, including adaptations to different numbers of players, of which the most important was the four-handed form, Cuadrillo or Quadrille. The reason for its amazing success is easy to understand: other games were based on long-established principles, but Ombre introduced players to a radically new principle of play, that of bidding, an innovation as exciting as that of trumps had been. It eventually died out, almost everywhere but in its native Spain, crushed by the weight of its ever-increasing complexity. But, before that happened, the idea of bidding was borrowed from it and transferred to a great many trick-taking games in which, originally, bidding had not figured. It is easy to recognise that it was from Ombre that the practice had been derived, because the transference was often rather mechanical, various Ombre bids being rather awkwardly superimposed upon the existing game, and because the terminology was frequently also borrowed from Ombre. Throughout this process, the fundamental idea of Ombre bidding survived intact: the purpose of the bidding was to determine who should play against whom, and under what conditions; once play began, what one side had to do in order to beat the other remained unaffected by the bidding. This was even true of four-handed games like Quadrille: the bidding would settle whether the declarer was to have a partner, or whether he was to play alone against the other three, and who, if anyone, his partner was to be. The most usual means of determining a partner was for the declarer to name the King of a plain suit, the King being in Ombre games the highest card; the player holding that King would be his partner, but did not announce the fact, which became apparent only in the course of play. This idea, with the Ace replacing the King in games like Schafkopf and Call-Ace Euchre in which the Ace is high, is found in countless other games, including Tarot games, having been adapted from Quadrille; it is indeed of basic importance for the later history of four-handed Tarot games. In one respect, however, the example of Ombre was not copied in other games. In Ombre proper, the declarer's object was to win more tricks than either of his two opponents taken separately: there were nine tricks in each round, and, if the declarer won four, while his opponents had won, respectively, three and two, the declarer had won the round. But in all the games into which Ombre bidding was imported, whether three- or four-handed, no distinction was made between the tricks won by those in temporary alliance. Whether two were playing against two, or one against three, or one against two, the object of the declarer and of his partner, if any, was, if the game was a simple one, to win more tricks between them than did the opponents taken together; if the game was a complex one, it was to make more points between them on the cards they won in tricks than did the opponents taken together.

Bridge, which belongs to the Whist family, is now the most famous trick-taking game in which there is bidding; but the Whist family, although dating back to the game of Triumph played in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was virtually the last family of trick-taking games into which bidding was introduced. This is because games of the Whist family are characteristically played by four players in fixed partnerships; it was for just such games that bidding, as originally understood, was otiose. The first game of the Whist family to adopt bidding was Boston, which abandoned the feature of fixed partnerships. Boston reached France from North America during the American War of Independence, and rapidly became the rage, the first game to challenge

Ombre for supremacy, and the first of many imports into European card play from the United States. It was a simple trick-taking game for four players, with a complicated bidding system in which, as in Quadrille, the successful bid determined whether, in that round, one was to play against three or two against two, and which one or which two. But Boston, of which the simplified living descendant is Solo Whist, also underwent some evolution, in the course of which a new idea became prominent, that of bids which affected what was required in order to win. It was this idea which was later to be so successfully introduced into Bridge, originally a Whist variant with a dummy but no bids; only on this basis could bidding, in a game with fixed partnerships, have a role to play.

That the introduction of bidding into Tarot games was originally a conscious adaptation from Ombre and its offshoots is shown by the fact that, in Germany, the earliest such games were known as Tarok-l'Hombre or Tarok-Quadrille, and, in Lombardy, as Tarocc'Ombre. In Piedmont such games were known collectively as Permessi; but the Ombre origin is clearly shown by the use of the term *ombra* for the player playing alone against the others, and by that of the term *sans prendre,* borrowed from French Ombre terminology, as the name of a bid. The adaptation was probably first effected in Italy, since in the German Tarok-l'Hombre games an Italian terminology, *a due, ad una*, etc., was used for the bids. The Permesso games probably originated in the 1750s; we know from Baretti's book that a four-handed form was in existence by 1768.

Three-handed Permesso

The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, which he may do in any manner that he pleases; but he must announce his intended manner of distributing the cards before he commences the deal, and is penalised for failing to do so. In the last round of the deal, he takes the last three cards for himself, and discards three. He may not discard honours, nor, according to *RI*, trumps either. After the dealer has said, 'Ho scartato' ('I have discarded'), the bidding begins.

The bidding is opened by the player on the dealer's right. There are four possible positive bids, which are, in ascending order: 'Permesso' ('Allow me'); 'A due' ('With two'); 'Ad una' ('With one'); and 'Sans prendre' ('Without taking'). No player is obliged to make a positive bid; if he does, he must make the lowest that he legally can. If a player wishes to pass before any positive bid has been made, he says 'Io passo' ('I pass'); to pass in response to a positive bid, he says 'Andate' ('Proceed'). Once a player has passed, he has no opportunity to re-enter the bidding. Presumably, if no player makes a positive bid, the hands are thrown in and there is a new deal by the next dealer in rotation. The mechanics of the bidding constitute what we shall call a single-round bidding procedure, which is used in a number of Tarot games in which there is bidding. The first player, in opening the bidding, has the option of saying either 'Permesso' or 'Io passo'. If he says 'Permesso', the player to his right must choose between passing by saying 'Andate' or overbidding with 'A due'. If the second player says 'A due', the first player is the next to speak, for the second time: he may pass by saying 'Andate', or he may, if he wishes, claim the prior right to make an 'A due' bid, which he does by saying 'A due anch'io' ('I also with two'). If he says 'A due anch'io', the second player must again choose between passing and making the next higher bid, which is now 'Ad una'. The first and second players continue in this way, before the third player (the dealer) has an opportunity to speak, until one of them has said 'Andate'; while the auction between the first and second players continues, the first player has only to equal the last bid made by the second, while the second player must bid one level higher. If the second player reaches the highest level, 'Sans prendre', the bidding ends with the first player's saying 'Andate' or 'Sans prendre anch'io', without the third player's getting the chance to bid. Otherwise, the third player has the option of either passing or making a bid one higher than the last bid made, and there then occurs an auction between him and the survivor from the auction between the first two players, in exactly the same form as before. If, after the first player says 'Permesso', the second player immediately says 'Andate', the third player then has the choice of saying either 'Andate' or 'A due', and, in the latter case, an auction then occurs, as before, between him and the first player. Likewise, if the first player says 'Io passo', the second player may either pass or say 'Permesso'; if he says 'Permesso', the third player may pass or say 'A due', and, in the latter case, there is an auction between him and the second player. If both the first two players pass, the third player may pass or say 'Permesso', in either case ending the bidding.

The following example may illustrate this procedure: A is the player to the dealer's right, and C is the dealer.

A: Permesso.
B: A due.
A: A due anch'io.
B: Ad una.
A: Andate.
C: Sans prendre.
B: Sans prendre anch'io.

C cannot outbid B's 'Sans prendre', so the bidding is concluded, and B is the declarer at the level of *sans prendre*. Here is a further example:

A: Permesso.
B: A due.
A: A due anch'io.
B: Andate.
C: Ad una.
A: Ad una anch'io.
C: Sans prendre.
A: Andate.

This time C becomes the declarer at the level of *sans prendre*. These examples are rather unlikely, and are meant only to show how the procedure works.

A bid does not determine the level at which the successful bidder or declarer is to play, but only sets a lower bound to it. Hence, when the bidding is over, the declarer, who, as *'ombra'*, is to play alone against the other two, who are temporary allies, has to decide the level at which he will play. There are, in ascending order, four possible levels: *a tre*; *a due*; *ad una*; and *sans prendre*. If the declarer said only 'Permesso', he may play at any level; if he made one of the other bids, he may play at the level indicated by his highest bid or at a higher one. If he plays *a tre*, he selects three low cards from his hand and places them face down in the centre of the table; he then announces any three particular cards which he does not have in his hand (and which, if he is dealer, he has not discarded); for instance, he may announce, 'Angelo, Bagatto and King of Batons'. The player or players who have these cards in their hands have to surrender them to him for inclusion in his hand; they each replenish their hands from the three cards on the table, without showing them, each taking as many cards as he surrendered. It is not explained what happens if the declarer calls for a card that the dealer has discarded, a Queen for example. Since, in discussing four-handed Permesso, *PE* mentions the possibility of asking for a Queen or even a Cavallo, he is presumably given the discarded card for which he had called, the dealer substituting for it one of the cards on the table; if the rule were that he had to forgo a card he had called for when it was in the discard, it would never be safe to call for anything but an honour or a trump.

When the declarer plays *a due*, he places only two cards on the table and calls for two; when he plays *ad una* he places only one on the table and calls for one. At *sans prendre*, he places no cards on the table and calls for none; if he did not bid 'Sans prendre', he announces it now. When he is playing at any lower level, he need not announce it; his actions make his intention obvious.

The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick, regardless of who the declarer is. Play is as usual. The two opponents of the declarer behave during the round in all respects as partners: they keep in a single pile the cards either of them wins in tricks; if one of them plays the Folle, but takes no tricks, he will need to surrender it at the end of the round only if the other opponent has also taken no tricks. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in twos, making 91 points in all; an odd low card counts ½ point. It appears from *PE* that if the declarer makes 45½ points, there is a draw, and no payments are made. If the declarer makes 46 points or more, he has won. If he was playing *a tre*, the two opponents each pay him an *onoranza* of 2 game points; if *a due*, the *onoranza* is of 3 game points; if *ad una*, of 4 game points; and if *sans prendre*, of 5 game points. In addition, his card points are rounded up or down to the nearest multiple of 5, 47½ being rounded down to 45, but 48 rounded up to 50, and he is then paid by each opponent 1 game point for every 5 points he has above 45. If he has 45 points or fewer, he has lost: he then pays the appropriate *onoranza* to each opponent, and, in addition, 1 game point for every 5 points he is below 45 points, 43 points being rounded up to 45 and 42½ rounded down to 40. *RI* states instead that there is no *onoranza* when the declarer played *a tre*, and that the *onoranza* is of 1 game point *a due* and of 2 game points *ad una*; the book does not appear to envisage playing *sans prendre*. It can hardly be, however, that, when the declarer makes, say, 47 points *a tre*, he is paid nothing at all; so we should reckon that, on this system, he receives 1 game point from each opponent for a score between 46 and 47½, 2 game points from each for one between 48 and 52½, and so on, plus the *onoranza* if any. The upshot will be that he is awarded just 1 game point less by each opponent than on the *PE* system.

In order to decide whether, and how high, to bid, a player must estimate the number of points he can reasonably count on making by means of the hand he will have when he has asked for and received cards from the other players. A void in a suit is probably worth at least 9 points. Length in trumps is not so important in the three-handed game; what matter are the court cards, suitably guarded.

The bidding procedure given here is borrowed from Ombre, and is found, with variations, in a great many European trick-taking games; it is, for instance, essentially that used in the German national game of Skat. (By the 'procedure' I mean the mechanics of the bidding, not the particular bids made.) It stands in contrast to the method of simple escalation, in an indefinite number of rounds, used in Bridge; those Tarot games which admit bidding usually employ either the single-round procedure or some intermediate one.

Four-handed Permesso

The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player, and takes the last two for himself, discarding two. The cards are counted in twos; since each will have an even number of cards, no draw is possible. All else is just as in three-handed Permesso. Length in trumps is here a much more important consideration in deciding whether to bid.

Five-handed Permesso or Quintilio

The dealer gives fifteen cards to each player, and takes the last three for himself, discarding three. All else is as in three-handed Permesso.

Sestilio

This is simply a six-handed Permesso. It is not mentioned in *RI*, and is said by the author of *PE* to be uncommon. Thirteen cards are dealt to each player; the dealer takes no extra cards and of course discards none. Bidding is as usual, but it is unlikely that anyone will make a bid higher than *'Permesso'* or attempt to play at a level higher than *a tre*. If someone plays *a tre* and wins, he is paid 2 game points by each of the others, plus one game point for every 5 points he makes above 45, as at three-handed Permesso. If, in the bidding, all six players pass, the hands are not thrown in, but each player plays for himself in what is called a *giuoco sciolto* (loose game): the player to win the highest number of points wins the round, and is paid 1 game point by each of the other players. When a *giuoco sciolto* is played, a player who plays the Folle gives a low card in exchange to the winner of that trick immediately, if he has one among the cards he has won, or as soon as he can, for fear of forgetting who won the trick.

Settilio

This is a seven-handed Permesso, also unmentioned in *RI*, and called a bizarre game by the author of *PE*. The dealer gives eleven cards to each player, and takes the last card for himself, discarding one. All else is as in Sestilio.

Permesso Castrato

This game is mentioned only in *RI*; it differs from ordinary Permesso only in being played with the same shortened 54-card pack as Consiglio Castrato, that is, with one from which the Ace to 6 have been omitted in Swords and Batons, and the 5 to 10 in Cups and Coins. It may apparently be played either with three or with four players; Jacopo Gelli, who will be mentioned below, lists a five-handed version, though this seems rather unlikely. With three players, each will receive seventeen cards, and the dealer will take the last three for himself and discard three; on the assumption that the cards are counted in twos, there will be 79 points in all. With four players, each will receive thirteen cards, and the dealer will take the last two, and discard two. With 79 points on the cards altogether, 40 will be needed to win. If there really was a five-handed form, the dealer would have to give ten cards to each player, and take the last four for himself, discarding four, which would give him a great advantage.

Permesso with Bagatto ultimo

This form of Permesso is also mentioned only in *RI*. Apart from the additional feature of the Bagatto ultimo, it is exactly like ordinary Permesso. Since *RI* treats of ordinary Permesso (*Permesso semplice*), whether three-, four- or five-handed, under a single head, the Bagatto ultimo feature can presumably be added to a Permesso game with three, four or five players, though there is no explicit statement to that (or the contrary) effect. It is possible to announce an intention to win the last trick with the Bagatto; unfortunately, it is impossible to make any more detailed deductions about the game from the statement in *RI* of the laws governing penalties. It is thus not possible to say whether or not there was a bonus for winning the last trick with the Bagatto without having announced an intention to do so; whether any player had the right to announce an intention to make the Bagatto ultimo or only the declarer; or what was the bonus for making (or penalty for losing) the Bagatto ultimo. A reasonable guess would be to allow any player to announce Bagatto ultimo; to award a bonus of 6 game points for an unannounced Bagatto ultimo, with a penalty of 6 game points for losing the Bagatto in the last trick and of 1 game point for losing it in any trick before the last; and to award a bonus of 12 game points for an announced Bagatto ultimo, when successful, with a corresponding penalty of 12 game points for announcing Bagatto ultimo and failing to win the last trick with the Bagatto. If the declarer made Bagatto ultimo, each opponent would pay him the bonus, if he lost it, he would pay the penalty to each opponent; if an opponent made Bagatto ultimo, the declarer would pay the bonus to each opponent, and, if an opponent lost it, each opponent would pay him the penalty. If an opponent's Bagatto was lost in the last trick to another opponent, there would be no penalty, unless that opponent had announced Bagatto ultimo, in which case the full penalty would be paid. All this, however, is only conjecture.

Chiamare il Re

The game of Chiamare il Re (Call the King) is a special form of four-handed Permesso, of which *PE* and *RI* give markedly different versions. As usual, the dealer gives nineteen cards to each player, takes the last two cards for himself and discards two. According to *PE*, when the dealer has discarded, he may then do either of two things. He may name ('call') a particular King which is not in his hand, e.g. the King of Cups; or he may lay face down in the centre of the table a single card, which will of course be a low card, from his hand. If he calls a King, the player who holds that King will become his partner for that round. The player who holds the called King does not, however, announce the fact, which will become certain only when he plays that King to a trick. If the dealer has all four Kings, and only then, he may call a Queen instead; if he also has all four Queens, he may call a Cavallo, and if all four Cavalli as well, he will call a Jack (obviously a very rare occurrence). When the dealer has called a card, there can be no further bidding. The player to his right then leads to the first trick, and play is as usual; each player keeps beside him the cards he wins in tricks, because only the player with the called King knows for certain who the dealer's partner is, and he may not reveal the fact save by playing that King to a trick. As soon as the called King has been played, the cards won by the dealer and his partner may be united in a single pile, as also those won by the two opponents. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in twos: the dealer and his partner have won if they have 46 points or more, and have lost if they have 45 or less.

If, instead of calling a King or other card, the dealer places one of his cards face down on the table, that is an indication that he wishes to play alone *ad una* against the other three. In this case, however, any of the other three players has a prior right to play alone *ad una* rather than the dealer. Hence each in turn, beginning with the player on the dealer's right, must say either '*Andate*' or '*Ad una vado io*' ('I go *ad una*'). If any player says '*Ad una vado io*', each player subsequent to him in the bidding sequence, up to and including the dealer, must say either '*Andate*' or '*Io vado a sans prendre*' ('I go *sans prendre*'). If any of the other players wins the auction and becomes declarer, the dealer of course takes back into his hand the card he laid face down on the table, and all proceeds as in a Permesso contract of '*Ad una*' or '*Sans prendre*'; the same applies if the dealer has been forced to bid '*Sans prendre*'. If the other three players have all said '*Andate*' to the dealer, then he acts as does a declarer in Permesso who has said '*Ad una*'; if he in fact plays at the *ad una* level, the card he laid down becomes that he is offering in exchange for the one he asks for. In each case the player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick.

The scoring system is not stated by the author of *PE*. Presumably we are intended to take the scores for rounds played *ad una* or *sans prendre* as the same as in Permesso: that is, if the declarer wins *ad una*, he is paid by each of the three opponents 4 game points plus 1 game point for every 5 points he has above 45; if he wins *sans prendre*, he is paid by each opponent 5 game points plus one for every 5 points above 45; if he loses, he pays each opponent 4 or 5 game points, according to the level of the game, plus 1 game point for every 5 points he is below 45. What is uncertain is the payment when the dealer calls a King. It would seem reasonable to set it at 2 game points plus 1 game point for every 5 points above or below 45. The reward to each player will of course be much less than half that for winning *ad una*. If someone plays *ad una* and makes 46 points, he will receive 4 game points from each of the other three players, and so 12 game points in all; whereas if the dealer calls a King, and, together with his partner, makes 46 points, one of the opponents will pay him 2 game points and the other will pay his partner 2 game points. But the differential seems proportionate to the difficulty of the two feats.

The procedure stated in *RI* is quite different. Here the dealer must, having discarded, say '*Ho scartato*' as usual, whereupon the player to his right must either say '*Io passo*' or '*A due*'. Bidding proceeds in the usual way, but with only two possible positive bids, '*A due*' and '*Ad una*'. (While both sources are agreed that a bid of '*A tre*' is not allowed in this game, *PE* expressly forbids a bid of '*A due*', while *RI* expressly allows it; *PE* expressly allows a bid of '*Sans prendre*', while *RI* leaves it unmentioned, and does not seem to envisage it in this or in any Permesso.) Only if all three other players have passed does the dealer have the right to call a King, if he wishes, instead of making an ordinary bid. This is in sharp contrast with the procedure of *PE*, under which an initial decision by the dealer to call a King precludes any bid by another player. Both sources agree, however, that it is only the dealer who has the right to call a King.

Under the *RI* scores for Permesso games a declarer will be paid 1 game point by each opponent if he wins *a due*, and 2 game points if he wins *ad una*, plus the usual game point for every 5 points above 45, and will pay each opponent correspondingly if he loses. It would therefore seem reasonable to set the basic payment when the dealer calls a King at 1 game point. This is, however, only a conjecture.

Giuoco del Meno

This is a reverse game, mentioned only in *PE*. It may be played by two players with twenty-five cards each, by three players with twenty-five cards each, by four players with nineteen cards each, by five with fifteen cards each, by six with thirteen each or by seven with eleven each. There are no partners, but in each case every player plays for himself. The dealer does not take the odd cards at the end of the deal, and so there is no discard. There are no bids, declarations or score for Bagatto ultimo. Play is as usual, but, at the end of the round the cards are counted in twos, and the player with the lowest number of points wins the round.

The last three games to be described reflect a quite different circle of ideas.

Sedici

There are four players, and the dealer gives four cards to each, not taking any extra cards himself or discarding. He may deal as he wishes: in one round of four each, in two rounds of two each, in four rounds of one each, in a round of three each followed by a round of one each, or in a round of one each followed by a round of three each. Whatever he does, he must announce in advance how he is going to deal; failure to do so is penalised.

In this game the Folle does not serve as Excuse, but, instead, as the lowest trump; it behaves precisely like the other trumps, but is beaten by all of them, including the Bagatto. Play is otherwise as usual, the player to the dealer's right leading to the first trick. The cards are counted singly, the Folle counting 1 point, the other counting cards having their full usual values and the low cards counting nothing. Each player plays for himself, and bears in mind how many points he has so far gained. As soon as a player attains 16 points, he announces 'Fuora' ('Out'). If he is correct, each player who has 8 points or more pays him 1 game point, and each who has not reached 8 points pays him 2 game points. If, however, the player who said 'Fuora' is found not to have reached 16 points, he pays 1 game point to each of the other players (or 2 if he has not even reached 8 points). Since it will often happen that in four tricks no one makes 16 points, the question arises what happens in this case: although *PE* says nothing explicit about this, a reasonable guess is that there is a further deal of four cards to each player by the same dealer, and so on until someone goes out. If this is right, the continued deal must take place without returning to the pack the cards already played, since there is talk in *PE* of an opponent's challenging a player who has said 'Fuora' to count his cards.

Trentuno

Trentuno is said to be played exactly like Sedici, save that each of the four players receives eight cards in the deal, and 31 points are needed to go out; probably 15 points are enough to save a player from having to pay the winner double. However, even with two deals it will be quite common for no one to reach 31 points, and more are impossible without returning the cards already played to the pack. It may be that in Trentuno the round was, in such a case, abandoned without payment, or that all the cards were shuffled and redealt by the same dealer; neither *PE* nor *RI* gives any clue to practice in this respect.[3]

Trentuno al meno

This is a reverse game. Eight cards are dealt to each of four players, and the play and method of counting points on cards is as in Trentuno. No one claims '*Fuora*', and there can be no further distribution of cards in that round when the eight tricks have been played: the winner is that player who has the fewest points. *PE* mentions a similar reverse form of Sedici.

RI mentions one other game, called Sessantatre (Sixty-three), which does not figure in *PE*, but it is impossible to deduce anything about it save that a very small number of cards were given out in each deal. Jacopo Gelli, who contributed most of the article on games to the *Enciclopedia Italiana* (vol. XVII, Milan, 1933, s.v. 'Giuoco'), had evidently seen a later edition of *RI* or some similar work, but not, apparently, *PE* or any other actual description of the games. At any rate, the section on Tarocchi in his *Enciclopedia* article consists almost wholly of the laws about misdeals, revokes and the like, without any actual account of how to play, while his entry on Tarocchi in his own book *Piccola Enciclopedia di Giuochi e Passatempi* (4th edition, Milan, 1929, 6th edition, Milan, 1965) contains almost word for word the laws given in *RI* for three-handed Venticinque and for Partita, together with the same general 'codice piemontese' of laws for all Tarocchi games given in the *Enciclopedia*, and the barest description of the composition of the pack and the ranking and values of the cards, in Piedmontese style, that is with the XX superior to the XXI, but without explaining the manner of playing the Folle. Both the *Enciclopedia* article and the *Giuochi e Passatempi* cite a list of Piedmontese Tarocchi games, without explaining how they are played. This list comprises all those for which the laws and penalties are given in *RI*, with two others beside: Undici e mezzo (Eleven and a half) and Quindici (Fifteen). These may not be irrecoverable: the list and the 'Piedmontese code' were probably taken from *Il Giuocatore di Tarocchi* (Turin, 1846), which I have not seen. Gelli's list appears to fascinate some people: it reappears in *Giochi di Carte*, vol. II, Milan, 1969, s.v. 'Tarocchi', again with no explanation of the games save for three-handed Venticinque and Partita, and a cursory mention of Mittigati.

---

[3] *PE* states explicitly (in the section on Baronetti, p. 51) that in Sedici and Trentuno the cards are counted singly, and also states explicitly (pp. 13-14, 38) that in these games the Folle counts 1 point and the other counting cards have their standard values. It does not expressly say that low cards count nothing, and it would be possible to suppose that they counted 1 point each, making it much easier to reach the winning score in both games; but, if this is so, it is odd that it is not mentioned. Sedici and Trentuno are dealt with first in *PE* (as they also are in *RI*, as if they had some kind of priority), so that the ordinary method of counting, e.g. in twos, with two low cards counting 1 point, is not explained until after Sedici and Trentuno have been described.

The other region in which Tarocco became extremely popular after the reintroduction of the 78-card pack from France in the eighteenth century was Lombardy, where the predominant form was the four-handed one. There was also a three-handed game known as Reseghino, and versions of Tarocc'Ombre, with bidding as in the Permesso games of Piedmont, for various numbers of players. To judge by the invaluable bibliography of books on card games by A. Lensi,[4] the earliest published account of these games was contained in *Il Maestro de' Giuochi* published in Milan in 1811. I have not seen this first edition, but, of the editions published in 1830, 1832 and 1879, I have seen that of 1832, and, as far as I can judge, this same account was copied in *Il Giuocatore de' Tarocchi* (Milan, 1817) and in *Il Giuocatore in Conversazione* (1st edition, Milan, n.d.; 2nd edition, Milan, 1820; 3rd edition, Milan, 1843), *Il Giuocatore nella Sala di Conversazione* (Milan, 1825, 1838, 1848) and *Il Nuovo Giuocatore in Conversazione* (Milan, 1857), with the most minor variations. We have thus essentially a single account of these games, of which the section on Tarocc'Ombre is most carelessly written. A description of all the Lombard forms of the game is given by Louis d'Aguilar Jackson, writing under the pen-name 'Aquarius', in his *Italian Games at Cards* (London, 1890). Jackson was an engineer who was also an enthusiast for foreign card games, about which he published a number of small books. He even devised a game which he called English Tarocco, to be played with a special pack of 64 cards which he succeeded in inducing the firm of Goodalls to produce; this pack was quite unlike any ordinary Tarot pack, consisting of 52 suit cards and twelve 'Taro' cards, named the Castle, the Warship, the Dove, etc., and the game likewise differed from any known form of Tarot. Unfortunately, comparison of Jackson's accounts of games with what can in many cases be identified with certainty as his sources reveals that he frequently misunderstood his material, so that little reliance can be placed on them. In the present case, there is no reason to suppose that he had seen anything but the often reprinted account mentioned above.

We have already encountered the four-handed game now to be described, namely as played in Vienna in the mid-eighteenth century, and subsequently included in card-game books published in Germany and the Netherlands.

Four-handed Tarocco in Lombardy

Terminology

Trumps are called *tarocchi*, high trumps are called *mattatori*. The XXI is called the *Mondo* and the I the *Bagatto*; others are referred to by number. The Queen is called *Dama*, and a set of all four court cards of one suit in a hand is called an *imperiale*; a numeral card of a suit is called a *cartina* or a *sfaglia*. The Fool is called the *Matto*. The Mondo, Bagatto, Matto and the four Kings are called collectively honours (*onori*).

---

[4] Alfredo Lensi, *Bibliografia Italiana di Giuochi di Carte*, Florence, 1892.

Ranks and values of the cards

In the suits, the cards rank in their original order. In trumps, they rank in numerical order, so that the Mondo or XXI is the highest, and the I or Bagatto is the lowest. The Matto serves as Excuse, and may be led to a trick. The cards are counted in fours; two odd low cards count nothing. The values of the counting cards are:

Mondo	6 points
Bagatto	5 points
Matto	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Cavallo	3 points
Each Jack	2 points

There are thus 72 points altogether.

Deal

The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player (it is not specified how). In the last round, he turns face up the last card that he deals to each of the other three players. He then gives himself the last two cards, turning them face up. If either or both of these last two cards is an honour or a trump, he continues to turn cards of his hand face up until there are two exposed cards that are neither honours nor trumps (or until he has exposed his entire hand). When all have looked at the exposed cards, each picks up his hand. Any player may, before the dealer discards, propose going *a monte*. If all agree, the cards are thrown in, and there is a new deal by the next dealer. Otherwise the dealer discards two cards face down, which will ordinarily count for him and his partner. He may never discard an honour; he may not discard a trump unless he is compelled to by the requirement of not discarding an honour, but, if he does, he need not announce the fact. The player to the right of the dealer (called the *eletta*) asks the dealer if he has completed his discard, and, on receiving an affirmative answer, leads to the first trick. Play and deal are counter-clockwise.

Play and scoring

Play proceeds under the usual rules. The four players are divided into two fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. A game (*partita*) consists of four rounds, so that each player is dealer once. If, before a round is played, it is decided to go *a monte* and have a new deal, that counts as one of the four rounds, although there is no score: that dealer does not get to deal again in that game. The cards that each player wins in tricks are kept beside him, and joined to those won by his partner only at the end of the round; the dealer keeps the two cards he has discarded separately. When the Matto is played, it is, as usual, withdrawn and placed on top of the cards the player has won in tricks. The one who played the Matto immediately replaces it, before the trick is gathered up, by a card he has won in a previous trick: he may not take a card from among those won by his partner, nor, if he is the dealer, from those he has discarded. He may nevertheless play the Matto before he has won a trick; in that case, he must surrender a card to the player who won the trick to which he played the Matto as soon as he himself wins a trick. If he never wins a trick, he must surrender the Matto at the end of the round. If the dealer does not win a trick, he must surrender his two discarded cards to the winner of the last trick.

At the end of the round, the cards won by partners are put together and the points totalled. If both sides have won 36 points, neither scores. Otherwise, that side that has-gained more than 36 points records the excess of its score over 36, e.g. a side that has made 47 points records 11. At the end of the four rounds, the points recorded by each side are added up, and that side which has the highest total has won the game. If the winning side has between 1 and 35 points more in recorded score than the losers, it has a simple win (*semplice*), and each winner is paid 1 game point by one of the losers. If their total recorded score exceeds that of the losers by between 36 and 71 points, they have won a *reale*, and are paid 2 game points each; if they have an excess of between 72 and 107 points, they have won another *reale*, and each receives 3 game points; and so on. If the losers have no recorded score at all, the winners have won a *doppia* and receive an additional game point each. For winning every trick in a round, which is called making a *cappotto* (slam), there is an additional bonus of 2 game points. If a single player wins every trick in a round, it is called a *cappottone*, but there is no special bonus apart from that for *cappotto*.

Reseghino

This is a very straightforward game with three players, each playing for himself. The rank and values of the cards are as in the four-handed game, save that the Mondo or XXI is worth only 5 points; the cards are counted in threes, so that there are 78 points in all. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, and takes the last three for himself, discarding three, under the same restrictions as in the four-handed game; there is no mention of any cards being exposed. If the player who has the Matto makes no tricks, he surrenders the Matto at the end of the round to the player who won the trick to which it was played; if the dealer makes no tricks, he surrenders his discard to the winner of the last trick. A game consists of three rounds. At the end of each round, each player records the difference, positive or negative, between the points he has made and 26: the winner of the game is the player with the highest total score.

Three-handed Tarocc'Ombre

This is a game with bidding, similar to the Piedmontese Permesso, but played with a shortened 54-card pack. The Ace to 6 are omitted from Swords and Batons, and the 4 to 10 from Cups and Coins; in Swords and Batons, the cards rank in descending order, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, and, in Cups and Coins, K, Q, C, J, A, 2, 3, 4. The values of the cards are as in Reseghino, that is, 5 points each for the Mondo, Bagatto and Matto, and 5, 4, 3 and 2 points respectively for each King, Queen, Cavallo and Jack. The cards are counted in threes, so that there are 70 points altogether.

The dealer gives seventeen cards to each player, and takes the last three cards for himself, discarding three; he may not discard honours, and may discard a trump only if he has to. There are, in ascending order, three possible positive bids: '*Entro con due carte*' ('I come in with two cards'), '*Ad una*' ('With one') and '*A niente*' ('With nothing'). (The bid of '*A tre*' had evidently dropped out as making it too easy to succeed.) The bidding is opened by the player to the dealer's right. The bidding procedure is very carelessly described, but, as far as can be determined, it is as follows. Any player may pass rather than make a positive bid, but, once he has passed, he may not re-enter the bidding. In the first round of the bidding, each player must either pass or make a bid higher than any yet made; the first player to make a positive bid need not make the lowest possible bid of '*Con due carte*', but may start at the level of '*Ad una*', which he does by saying '*Entro con una carta*' ('I come in with one card'). (Presumably he may, if he wishes, say '*Entro con niente*', which will terminate the bidding.) If more than one player has made a positive bid, the bidding is still open. In the second round of the bidding, the first player who has not yet passed may now pass if he wishes, but also has the right instead to bid again at the *same* level as the last bid; if he passes, this right is acquired by the next player; a subsequent bidder must make a higher bid or pass. Thus, if the first player says, '*Entro con due carte*', the second player passes, and the dealer says '*Ad una*', the first player now has the right himself to say '*Ad una*'; the dealer must now either pass or say '*A niente*', and, if he passes, the first player becomes declarer at the level of '*Ad una*'. If, in this example, the dealer does say '*A niente*', the first player again has the right himself to say '*A niente*', which ends the bidding, the first player becoming declarer. The first player has, of course, the right to pass after each of the dealer's bids, if he wishes. Another example will illustrate the difference from the procedure in the Piedmontese Permesso games. The first player says '*Entro con due carte*' and the second player overbids him with '*Ad una*'. Unlike in Permesso, the first player does not yet have the right to speak again until the dealer has spoken. The dealer may either pass or say '*A niente*': suppose he does the latter. There is now a second round of bidding. The first player may either say '*A niente*' himself, in which case the bidding is over, or pass: if he passes, the second player must either pass or say '*A niente*'.

If the declarer has bid '*Con due carte*', he asks for any two cards he does not have in his hand: the player or players who hold these cards must surrender them, and the declarer gives two low cards from his hand, face down, in return. If he has bid '*Ad una*', he asks in the same way for one card; if '*A niente*', then of course he asks for none. (There is the same ambiguity as with Permesso about what happens if he asks for a card discarded by the dealer, but this is less likely in this game.) Now the player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out under the same rules as in Reseghino. If the declarer makes 36 points or more on the cards he wins in tricks, he has won; if he makes 35 points or fewer, he has unreservedly lost. If he has won, each opponent pays him 2 game points if he was playing *a due* (asked for two cards before play began), 3 game points if he was playing *ad una*, and, presumably, 4 game points if he was playing *a niente*, though this is not stated; in addition, he receives from each opponent 1 game point for every full set of 5 points he has above 35. Likewise, if he loses, he pays to each opponent 2, 3 or 4 game points, according to the level of the game, plus 1 game point for every full set of 5 points by which his score falls below 35. It is stated that, if the declarer makes a *cappotto* (slam), i.e. wins all the tricks, each opponent pays him 12 game points if he was playing *a due*, 13 game points if he was playing *ad una* (and, presumably, 14 if he was playing *a niente*). This appears to imply a bonus of 3 game points for *cappotto*. If the dealer has made a positive bid, but one of the other players becomes declarer, the declarer may surrender the round before a card has been played: in this case, he pays simply the basic payment to each opponent. The purpose of this is to make a sacrifice in order to prevent the dealer from achieving a *cappotto*.

Ombra arrabiata

This is simply the four-handed version of the preceding game. All the Tarocc'Ombre games are described together in a single account, and this four-handed form suffers particularly badly from a failure to be explicit. The 54-card pack is used, and each player receives thirteen cards, the dealer taking the last two and discarding two. It appears that the points are reckoned as in ordinary four-handed Lombard Tarocco: that is, the Mondo (XXI) is worth 6 points, the other counting cards have their usual values and the cards are counted in fours, two odd low cards held by the dealer counting nothing, making a total of 66 points altogether. All that is actually said is that 34 points suffice for a win, which is consistent with there being 66 or 67 points in all; the above conjecture seems the best way of accounting for this. The declarer will, if he wins, receive from each opponent the basic payment, according to the level at which he plays, plus 1 game point for every full set of 5 points he has above 33; if he loses, he will pay each opponent the basic amount plus 1 game point for every full set of 5 points he has below 33. The basic payment is stated to be 14 game points *a due*, 15 game points *ad una* (and, presumably, 16 *a niente*). This seems unreasonably high, and, since the sentence immediately follows one relating to the scores for *cappotto* in the three-handed game, it is probable that the text has become garbled (a not infrequent occurrence when an account of a game is repeatedly reprinted from one book to another). A reasonable guess would be that the basic payment is 4 game points *a due*, 5 game points *ad una* and 6 game points *a niente*, with a bonus of 4 game points for *cappotto*. All else is as in three-handed Tarocc'Ombre.

Five-handed Tarocc'Ombre

For this game a full 78-card pack is used, fifteen cards being dealt to each player and the last three being taken by the dealer, who discards three. When the declarer, if playing *ad una* or *a due*, has asked for and received one or two cards from the other players, he then 'calls', that is, names, any other card that he does not have, say the Mondo or a King, and the player who holds that card becomes his partner, without announcing the fact. It does not become certain who the declarer's partner is until the called card is played to a trick, and, at least until then, each player keeps separately the cards he has won in tricks. The only guidance to how the points are reckoned is the vague remark that, in Tarocc'Ombre games, 36 points are 'generally' needed for a win: since this is expressly stated not to be so in the four-handed game, it is likely to be so in the five-handed one. The only way that it appears possible to secure this is by counting the cards in fours, and valuing the Mondo at only 5 points, so as to make 71 points altogether. (If one, two or three odd low cards count nothing, there will be only 70 points when both sides have three odd cards, but this will not matter.) The general inaccuracy of the account leaves it possible, however, that the cards were counted in fives, giving a total of 67 points (if three odd low cards count nothing), with 34 needed to win. Nothing is said about the details of payment for win or loss. (One could make the value of each game twice its value in Ombra arrabiata for the opponents, three times that value for the declarer and his partner. E.g. if the declarer and his partner achieve a bare win *a due*, worth 4 points on the method suggested above for the four-handed game, then each opponent would pay 8 game points and each of the winners would receive 12; if they had a bare loss *a due*, declarer and his partner would each pay 12 game points and each of the opponents would receive 8.)

Seven-handed Tarocc'Ombre

The full 78-card pack is used, and each player receives eleven cards, the dealer taking the last one and discarding one. Play is as in the five-handed game. The account says that, if a player bids '*A niente*', he has to play without a partner, but this seems to make an absurd gap between the difficulty of winning *ad una* and that of winning *a niente*; it is again possible that the text has become garbled. No details are given either of the method of reckoning the points or of the system of scoring.

The 78-card Tarocco Piemontese pack is still produced by all Italian cardmakers. The game appears to have been on the wane throughout the twentieth century, but it is still played in both the Piedmontese and Lombard traditions. So far as I have been able to discover, it has died out completely in Milan. Signor Giampaolo Dossena has informed me that it is still played in Piacenza; a simple three-handed form, very close to the Reseghino described above, is played in Como, although the name *Reseghino* has been forgotten and the game is simply called *Tarocchi*. I have unfortunately had no opportunity to visit Piacenza or Como, but Mr John McLeod was given a verbal description of three-handed Tarocchi as played in Como by a gentleman from that town who had moved to Milan. Printed descriptions of modern Tarocchi games as played in Lombardy are rare. One account was given by Rino Fulgi Zaini in his book *Giochi di Carte*, first published in 1934 (7th edition, Milan, 1968). He gives two forms of the game as being then played in Lombardy, the simple three-handed game, which he says has no variants, and a modern form of Mitigati, of which the early Piedmontese form was explained earlier in this chapter, and which he says exhibits slight variations from place to place. Some confusion seems to have crept into Zaini's account of the simple game. For one thing, he says that, when the three cards discarded by the dealer count for him, a King counts 4 points, a Queen 3 and a Cavallo 2, while a Jack does not count; this statement is hard to reconcile with the earlier statements that a King may not be discarded and that there are 78 points altogether. Furthermore, he says that, in certain circumstances, the discarded cards do *not* count for the dealer; these circumstances appear to be that the dealer's trumps are exhausted before those of one of the other two players. The passage is, however, very obscure, and it is difficult to frame a clear rule on the basis of it. The likeliest explanation is that Zaini has mistaken some description of strategy for a rule of play: the strategy would be for the other two players to enter into a temporary alliance at the beginning of the round in order to try to exhaust the dealer's trumps, so as to prevent him from trumping their court cards, because he may by his discard have created one or even two voids. I shall, on this assumption, ignore these passages in stating the rules of the two games he describes.[5]

The following account is based on Zaini's description and on that given to John McLeod by the gentleman from Como. There are slight differences between them, indicated by 'Zaini' and 'Como'. McLeod was informed that the game is played for a small fixed stake, usually a drink.

Three-handed Tarocchi (Lombardy, twentieth century)

The terminology is exactly as in the four-handed Lombard game described above, save that the XXI is simply called *Ventuno* (Twenty-one). The ranking of the cards is also the same, so that the XXI is the highest trump and the suits rank in their original order. The values of the cards are:

XXI	5 points
Bagatto	5 points
Each King	5 points
Matto	4 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Cavallo	3 points
Each Jack	2 points

A 78-card Tarocco Piemontese pack is used, and the cards are counted in threes. The rules of play are as usual, and the Matto serves as Excuse. The one who plays it withdraws it as usual from the trick to which it was played, and places it with the cards he has won in tricks (or simply puts it on top of those cards without playing it to the table); he does not, however, give a card in exchange for it, either at that time or at the end of the round. When he counts his cards, he counts the Matto by itself, reckoning 4 points for it, and the rest in threes. Conversely, the player who won the trick to which the Matto was played will count the two cards of that trick (or the two cards remaining when he has counted the rest in threes) as if they were three; i.e., as worth 1 point if they are both low cards, as having the value of the counting card if they include just one such, and as one less than the sum of their values if both are counting cards. Thus the reduction of the value of the Matto to 4 points is no more than a formal difference due to its not being replaced by a low card; there are therefore still 78 points altogether. No rule is stated by Zaini to the effect that, if the player who has the Matto makes no tricks, he has to surrender it; it is uncertain what the practice is in this regard in Como.

Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each of the other players and twenty-eight to himself, discarding three. According to Zaini, he deals the cards in five rounds of five cards each, beginning with the player to his right, and taking, in addition, the last three cards for himself. In present-day Como, he deals in a single round, giving the first twenty-five cards to the player to his right, the next twenty-five to his other opponent, and taking the remaining twenty-eight for himself; in so doing, he turns face up the last card dealt to each player, including himself. If any player has no trumps, the deal is annulled, and there is a new deal by the same dealer; for this purpose, the Matto counts as a trump. The cards discarded by the dealer count to him at the end of the round. The restrictions on his discard observed by players in Como are not known. According to Zaini, he may not discard Kings, and he may not discard either trumps or the Matto save in a special case. This special case is that in which he has the Bagatto and just two other trumps, counting the Matto as a trump. In this case alone, he may discard all three trumps; but he must discard all or none. The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. Each player scores, at the end of the round, the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 26 points; at Como, a game consists of three rounds, the winner being of course the player with the highest cumulative score, who is paid a fixed stake by each of the other two. It is not stated by Zaini that, if the dealer makes no tricks, he has to surrender his discard, and it is probable that this is not the rule; but the practice in present-day Como in this respect has not been ascertained.

---

[5] In case anyone can put a better interpretation on it, the passage from Zaini runs as follows: 'Per una convenzione le figure dello scarto (escluso il Fante) sono dovute allo scartante, quando non sia stato smontato di tarocchi, prima che si siano verificate uscite nel seme scartato. Il mazziere che facesse sortita di tarocchi, giocando di mano, perderà il diritto allo scarto. Lo scarto è dovuto al mazziere solo se il giocatore non riuscirà a farsi le proprie figure. Le figure dello scarto vanno pagate al mazziere in ragione di quattro punti per il Re, tre per la Dama e due per il Cavallo. Esiste pure la convenzione che quando due giocatori abbiano salvato lo scarto taroccando, si debbano rispettare le prese di figure in quel seme nel limite del possibile. Per il Fante la convenzione cessa. Però due giocatori perfetti rispettano anche quella presa se appena possibile. L'alleanza finisce a scarto salvato, e non ha neppure luogo quando uno dei due cessasse o non iniziasse l'offensiva a tarocchi contro lo scartante. Allora il rispetto per le figure dello scarto cessa, ed ognuno dei due cercherà di prenderne più che può all'altro' (Zaini, op. cit., 1968, pp. 94-5).

Zaini's account is the only evidence known to me that the game of Mitigati, which must have been imported from Piedmont, is or has been played in Lombardy in the twentieth century. It is certainly played in present-day Piedmont, as will be explained below; but the differences are sufficiently great to make it worth setting out Zaini's game separately.

Mitigati (Lombardy, twentieth century)

There are three players. The play and the points on cards won in tricks are just as in the preceding game, as are the ranking and values of the cards. The deal and play are counter-clockwise. The cards are dealt in five rounds of five cards each, beginning with the player to the dealer's right, the dealer taking eight cards in the last round of the deal. After each of the second, third and fourth rounds of the deal, when the players each have, respectively, ten, fifteen and twenty cards, there is a pause to decide whether or not to continue the deal. Each looks at the hand so far dealt to him. The player to the right of the dealer then either says 'I pass', meaning that he would like to abandon the deal, or calls for the deal to continue. If he passes, the second player has the same choice; and if he also passes, the dealer decides whether or not to continue the deal. As soon as any player demands the continuation of the deal, the next five cards are dealt out to each player; if all three pass, the hands are thrown in, and there is a new deal by the same dealer. After the final round of the deal, there is no longer an opportunity to call for a new deal. The dealer discards three cards, under the same restrictions as those stated by Zaini for the simple three-handed game described above.

The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. Each player, just before he plays his card to the first trick, has the opportunity to make any of the following declarations of cards he holds in his hand:

Tarocchi. This consists of ten trumps, the Matto counting for this purpose as a trump. The player has to show his ten trumps to the other two players. There is no additional bonus for having more than ten trumps; if he has more, he may select the ten that he shows, and need not say how many he has. He is immediately paid 5 game points by each of the other two players.

Onori. The honours (*onori*) are, as usual, the four Kings and the XXI, Bagatto and Matto. A declaration of *Onori* may be made by a player having any four of these: they do not have to be shown to the other players, and there is no bonus for having more than four, so that it is unnecessary to say how many one has. The player is immediately awarded 5 game points by each of the other two.

Mitigati di Tarocchi. This consists of the XXI, Bagatto and Matto. The player is paid 10 game points by each of the other two.

Mitigati di Re. This consists of all four Kings; one may not claim *Onori* in addition. The player is awarded 15 game points by each of the other two.

If a player is fortunate enough to be able to make more than one of these declarations, he may do so; the same cards may be used in two or more declarations, e.g. the three cards of the *Mitigati di Tarocchi* may count also among ten *Tarocchi*, or, with a King, as three of four *Onori*. A combined declaration of *Mitigati di Tarocchi*, *Onori* and *Tarocchi* (worth 20 game points from each opponent) is called a *Piatto* (plate), and one of *Mitigati di Tarocchi*, *Mitigati di Re* and *Tarocchi* (worth 30 game points from each) a *Piattone* (dish).

Zaini recommends, as a minimum on which to call for a continuation of the deal after receiving ten cards, five trumps or three trumps and one honour; and, as a minimum after receiving fifteen cards, the so-called *rottura* (breakage), namely one King and either the XXI, Bagatto or Matto, unless one has hopes of obtaining ten trumps.

At the end of the round, each player who has more than 26 points receives in all, as many game points as he has card points in excess of 26, and, conversely, each player who has less than 26 points pays as many game points as he has card points below 26.

Published information about Tarocchi as now played in Piedmont is even harder to come by.

The two-volume anonymous compilation *Giochi di Carte* published by Edizioni Librex in Milan in 1969 has an article on Tarocchi which describes the game according to the Piedmontese tradition. Three forms of the game are recognised: a simple three-handed game, called *in Tre e Venticinque*; a four-handed game, called *Partita*, played in two fixed partnerships; and three-handed *Mitigati*. The accounts are very sketchy, and should not be relied on too heavily. Mr John McLeod was able, on a recent visit to Turin and the nearby town of Pinerolo, to obtain more detailed information from actual players. The simple three-handed game is called Scarto in Pinerolo, to distinguish it from Mitigati, which is very popular there, but is called simply Tarocchi in Turin. In Turin the simple four-handed game, with partners, is more often played than the three-handed one, but is also simply called Tarocchi. These games are ordinarily played for small stakes, but Mitigati, which is also played in Turin, is usually played for quite high ones. There are slight differences between the games as played in the two centres, which do not call for separate description.

Scarto (Pinerolo and Turin, present day)

This is a simple form of game for three players, called Scarto in Pinerolo but simply Tarocchi in Turin. Trumps are called *tarocchi*, the XX is called the *Angelo* and the XXI the *Mondo*; according to Librex, the I is called the *Bigatto* and the Fool *il Folle*, though players in Turin and Pinerolo appear normally to call the latter *il Matto*. Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The rank and values of the cards are as in the Piedmontese tradition: that is to say, the suits rank in their original order, the *Angelo* (XX) is superior to the *Mondo* (XXI), but otherwise the higher-numbered trumps beat the lower-numbered ones, and the point-values are as follows:

Angelo (XX)	5 points
Bigatto (I)	5 points
Each King	5 points
Folle or *Matto*	4 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Cavallo	3 points
Each Jack	2 points

The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each of the other two players and twenty-eight to himself. In Turin, the deal is in a single round, starting with the player to the dealer's right; the dealer gives each of his two opponents his twenty-five cards in a single batch, and takes the last twenty-eight cards for himself. In Pinerolo the cards are dealt in five rounds of five cards each, starting with the player to the dealer's right, the dealer taking the last eight cards. In neither case is any card exposed in the deal. The dealer discards three cards, which count to him at the end of the round; he may not discard a King, the *Angelo* (XX) or the *Folle* or *Matto*. He may discard the *Bigatto* (I) only if it is his only trump.

The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. Play is under the usual rules. The *Folle* or *Matto* serves as Excuse, but no card is given in exchange for it. It is legal to lead it to a trick, in which case the next player may play any card, to which the third player has to follow suit, if he can, or, if he cannot, to play a trump if he can. At Pinerolo, the player who has the *Folle* or *Matto* retains it even if he makes no tricks; likewise, the dealer retains his discard even if he makes no tricks. In Turin, the players spoken to, who normally played the four-handed game, did not know what happened in either of these cases. At the end of the round, the cards are counted in threes; the *Folle* or *Matto* is counted separately, and the player who won the trick to which it was played counts his two odd cards as if they were three. There are thus 78 points altogether, just as in the game played in Lombardy. Each player scores the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 26. A game consists of three rounds, the object being to avoid having the lowest score: the player with the lowest cumulative score pays a small stake to each of the other two, usually buying them a drink.

The simple four-handed game, popular in Turin, is not much played at Pinerolo, though it is known there. The name *Partita* does not appear to be still in use for it.

Four-handed Tarocchi (Turin and Pinerolo, present day)

Deal and play are counter-clockwise. There are two fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. The rank and values of the cards and the rules of play are as in Scarto. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each of the other three players and twenty-one to himself; he deals the cards in a single round, beginning with the player to his right, so that each player receives all his cards in a single batch. The dealer discards two cards, which count to his side at the end of the round, under the same restrictions as in Scarto. In Turin, the cards are counted in fours, the dealer's discard of two cards counting as if it were a set of four: there are thus 72 points altogether. Since, as in Scarto, no card is given in exchange for the *Folle* or *Matto*, it is counted separately, the side which won the trick to which it was played counting three cards as if they were four. At Pinerolo, however, the cards are apparently counted in threes, so that there are 78 points altogether.[6] In Turin, if the side having the *Folle* or *Matto* takes no tricks, they must surrender it to their opponents; likewise, if the dealer's side makes no tricks, the dealer's discard must be surrendered. At Pinerolo, the discard is in such a case retained by the dealer's side and the *Folle* or *Matto* by the side that held it.

In Turin it is permissible for each player to give information about his hand immediately after playing to any trick. No secret code can be used, and the information must be true. The type of information is normally that the player has the highest outstanding card of some specified suit, or the highest outstanding trump, or that he has a certain number of trumps, or a certain number of cards in some suit, or that he has a particular card. Information about trumps can be given only immediately after playing a trump; information about the plain suits can be given at any time. The only allowable means of making a suggestion to one's partner about what card to play is by means of a signal effected by drawing the card being played towards the player: that is, he makes as if to play to the trick, but then, keeping hold of the card, briefly slides it back towards himself before finally putting it back in the trick. This signal is a request to his partner to allow him to take the trick.

At the end of each round, each side scores the difference, positive or negative, between their point-total and 36 (or 39 in Pinerolo). A game consists of four rounds: the losers pay a fixed stake, usually a drink, to the winners.

Mitigati is still played enthusiastically both in Pinerolo and in Turin, usually for high stakes, and in forms somewhat different from the Lombard one described above.

Three-handed Mitigati (Pinerolo, present day)

Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The rank and values of the cards are as in Scarto. However, the cards are counted *singly*, each low card counting 1 point and the *Folle* or *Matto* counting 4: there are thus altogether 129 points. The rules of play are as in Scarto, including those governing the *Folle* or *Matto*, which always belongs to the player who holds it, even if he makes no tricks; similarly, the dealer's discard belongs to him, even if he makes no tricks.

As a result of each round, each player will receive a positive or negative score. The scores of the three players always add up to zero, and a player's cumulative score for any number of rounds represents the total amount of money he is to pay or receive. At three stages during the deal, there is a bargaining session in which the players may agree what each player should score for the round, the three figures totalling zero. If agreement is reached, the hands are thrown in, those scores are recorded and there is a new deal by the same dealer.

The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each of his opponents and twenty-eight to himself. He deals the cards in five rounds of five cards each, starting with the player to his right, and taking the remaining eight cards in the final round of the deal. The bargaining sessions take place when each player has ten cards, when each has fifteen, and when each has twenty. Each player in turn, beginning with the one to the dealer's right, may do one of four things:

(i) he may pass, by saying '*Passo*', thus proposing to throw in his hand for a zero score;

(ii) he may demand a given number of game points, which he does by saying '*Chiedo* ...', naming a number, thus agreeing to abandon the hand for the stated positive score;

(iii) he may offer a given number of points, which he does by saying '*Offero* ...', naming a number, thus agreeing to abandon the hand for the stated negative score; or

(iv) he may demand that the deal should continue, which he does by saying '*Vedo*'.

The moment any player says '*Vedo*' ('I see'), the bargaining session comes to an end and the deal is continued. Otherwise, the bargaining continues in rotation until the scores offered and demanded add up to zero, in which case the hands are thrown in and the score recorded. At his second and subsequent turns to speak in a given bargaining session, a player is not allowed to modify his proposal so as to make it more favourable to himself. Thus, if he has made an offer, he may make a better offer, but may not make a lower one, still less pass or make a demand; if he has passed, he may pass again or make an offer, but may not make a demand; and if he has made a demand, he cannot demand more, though he may demand less, or pass or even make an offer. Any player is at liberty to say '*Vedo*' at any time. These restrictions affect only what is said in *one* bargaining session; what a player said in one such session does not restrict what he may say in a later one during the same deal.

---

[6] Given that no card is given in exchange for the *Folle* or *Matto*, great care will be needed to obtain a correct tally when the cards are counted in threes in a four-handed game. The difficulty arises in the case in which the side which has the *Folle* has two cards left over when their cards are counted out in threes, and the opposing side has just one odd card. If the usual principle is followed that two odd low cards count 1 point and one odd low card counts nothing, then, in such a case, when the *Folle* is counted separately, each side will have one odd card, and the combined point-totals will come to only 77. The correct rule, in such a case, should be that, if the side holding the *Folle* won the trick to which it was played, they should count an extra point, while, if their opponents won that trick, they should count the extra point.

If agreement is not reached by the third bargaining session, the deal is completed, and the dealer discards three cards, under the same restrictions as in Scarto. The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. Each player, just before he plays to the first trick, has the opportunity to make any of the following declarations:

Ten or more *Tarocchi*	10 + 1
Reale (four Kings)	20+ 5
Mitigati (the XX, the I and the *Matto*)	15 + 5
Onori	10 + 5

The figures shown on the right are the payments made by *each* opponent for the given declaration. Thus one who declares ten *Tarocchi* scores 20 game points, 10 from each opponent, while the opponents each mark a score of minus 10 game points. '10 + 1' means that the payment is 11 game points for eleven *Tarocchi*, 12 game points for twelve, etc. In making a *Tarocchi* declaration, a player may count the *Folle* or *Matto* as a trump, and must show the trumps to the other players. Honours (*onori*) are the four Kings, the XX, the I and the *Folle* or *Matto*: a declaration of *Onori* requires the player to hold any four of these. The '+ 5' after the values of the *Reale, Mitigati* and *Onori* declarations indicates that, to any of these, the player may add any additional honour, for an extra score of 5 game points from each opponent: thus a *Reale* accompanied by the XX is worth 25 game points, *Mitigati* accompanied by a King 20 game points, etc. No card may be used in more than one declaration of *Reale, Mitigati* and *Onori*, but it is permissible to include a card both in one of those declarations and in a declaration of *Tarocchi*. In making *Reale, Mitigati* and *Onori* declarations, the cards are not shown.

At the end of each round, each player scores the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 43.

The game is played under slightly different rules in Turin, and I am uncertain of the accuracy of the following account.

Three-handed Mitigati (Turin, present day)

All is as in the form played at Pinerolo, save that it is uncertain whether the bargaining sessions take place, and the allowable declarations are different, as follows:

Tarocchi	10
Mitigati	20
Reale	10
Onori	10

Only eight trumps are required for a declaration of *Tarocchi*, and there is no additional score for having more than eight. It is not permissible to add an honour to a *Mitigati, Reale* or *Onori* declaration. Probably the rules about using the same card twice are as in the Lombard form, namely that a *Reale* declaration may not be combined with one of *Onori*, but otherwise any card may be freely used twice. The score given for *Onori* is uncertain.

There is also a form for four players, about which my information, derived, as with all the games currently played in Turin and Pinerolo, from Mr McLeod, is somewhat uncertain.

Four-handed Mitigati (Pinerolo and Turin, present day)

Each player plays for himself. All is as in the three-handed game, with the following exceptions. Each opponent of the dealer receives nineteen cards, and the dealer receives twenty-one, discarding two. The method of dealing is not known. At Pinerolo, the allowable declarations are:

Tarocchi	5
Reale	15
Mitigati	10
Onori	5

Only eight trumps are required for a declaration of *Tarocchi*. If the player making this declaration holds the *Bigatto* (I), he must show it together with his seven highest trumps; if he does not hold it, he must show his eight highest trumps. There is no extra score for having more than eight trumps. It is likewise not permissible to add an honour to a declaration of *Reale, Mitigati* or *Onori*; only three honours are needed for the *Onori* declaration. As before, the figures indicate the payment from each opponent, so that one who makes a declaration of *Mitigati* marks a positive score of 30 game points, each of the three opponents marking minus 10.

In Turin, the declarations are as follows:

Tarocchi	10
Reale	10
Mitigati	20
Onori	10

As at Pinerolo, only three honours are needed for an *Onori* declaration, but only seven trumps are required for one of *Tarocchi*.

At the end of each round, the dealer scores the difference, positive or negative, between his point-total and 33 points, while the others each score the difference between their point-totals and 32.

54-card Tarocco Piemontese packs have continued to be fitfully produced throughout the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries; one is currently issued by Viassone of Turin. I have no information, however, about the games currently played in Piedmont with this shortened pack. A curiosity is a non-trick-taking game played in Turin at the present day with the 78-card Tarocco Piemontese under the name of *Diavolo*; it is so called because any player receiving the XV (the Devil) as his first card wins outright. It is a gambling game of a familiar type.

Diavolo (Turin, present day)

There are two players, using a 78-card Tarocco Piemontese pack. Each player's object is to obtain cards totalling nearer to 15 than his opponent's cards, without exceeding 15. Every court card is valued at 10 points, each trump and each numeral card at face-value, and the *Folle* or *Matto* at 1 point. The dealer gives one card face down to his opponent and one face down to himself. His opponent, having looked at his card, may, if he wishes, demand further single cards to be dealt to him, face up, one at a time until he is satisfied. The dealer can then deal himself single cards face up until he is satisfied. If either player's total overshoots 15, he must immediately throw in his cards, and his opponent scores for the round.

Betting occurs immediately after both players have seen their first card; the dealer's opponent bets first. Betting also takes place after each card dealt face up to either player, and before that player has indicated whether he wants a further card; the recipient of the card bets first. Each round is initially worth 1 game point. The player who begins a particular session of betting can either pass or propose to increase the score for the hand by any amount he pleases. If he passes, his opponent can either pass or try to raise the score. If both players pass in the first betting session, when they have one card each, the cards are thrown in with no score for the round. If both players pass in a later betting session, the round is continued with no change to the score. If one of the players proposes an increase in the score, his opponent may either surrender or accept. If the opponent surrenders, the cards are thrown in and the round comes to an end, the player who proposed the increase scoring the value at which the round stood before he made his proposal. If the opponent accepts, he then has in turn the option of either passing or proposing a further increase; if he passes, play continues for the newly agreed score. If the stage is reached at which the dealer has given his opponent all the extra cards he wants, and has then taken as many cards as he wants himself, without either player having overshot 15 or surrendered, both players then expose their hands and the player with the larger total gains the score for the round; if both players have the same total, the opponent of the dealer wins. If a player is dealt the trump XVI or higher as his first card, he is immediately over the limit, but it is in this case legal for him to wait to see if his opponent passes, so as to be able to throw in his card for no score without having to expose it; it is not legal, however, for him to raise or accept a raise. In all other cases, a player must immediately throw in his cards as soon as he overshoots 15. A game continues until one player has attained a cumulative score of 50 game points. The same player deals for the whole game. Cards which have been used in play are not replaced in the pack, and the pack is not shuffled or cut between rounds, The used cards are employed to keep a tally of the score, a card face down in front of a player representing 1 game point, and one face up representing 10 game points.

There is also a game, called Giuoco del Nove, resembling Baccarat, of which the following is an incomplete description.

Giuoco del Nove (Turin, present day)

There are several players, a 78-card Tarocco Piemontese pack being used. The dealer is banker. The values of the cards are the same as in Diavolo. The object is, as in Baccarat, to make a total whose remainder when divided by 10 is as large as possible. The players other than the banker place their bets, and each player, including the banker, receives two cards and may, if he wishes, ask for a third. The banker then settles up with each of the other players separately. A player who gets a total of 9 takes over the bank.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Tarok-l'Hombre

In Piedmont, among the many Tarocco games played were the Permesso games, in which the idea of bidding was imported from Ombre; and just the same idea was found in the Tarocc'Ombre of Lombardy. In Italy itself this innovation did not endure; but, in the long run, it was to prove by far the most fruitful for the game of Tarot in general of all the new developments we have looked at up to now. The particular types of bids used in the three-handed games, known as Mediateur bids, were not so important, although the idea, borrowed from Quadrille, of calling a King to determine a temporary partner of the declarer was to become a feature of a number of popular four-handed Tarot games. The crucial step was, rather, the introduction of bidding of any kind into Tarot games, which had hitherto been either four-handed ones with fixed partners or three-handed ones in which, in each round, every player played for himself alone. That, of course, continued to be the case in Grosstarock: but, outside Italy, the true future of Tarot games lay in those that incorporated bidding and in which, therefore, there were, in each round, just two sides, a declarer against the other two in three-handed games and, in four-handed ones, either one against the remaining three or two temporary partners against the other two. Most of the games of this type will be described in Part IV of this book; in this chapter we are concerned with the earliest such games played in Austria and Germany. They were known generally as Tarok-l'Hombre, and, as their Italian terminology makes evident, were certainly imported from Italy, very probably from Lombardy via Austria. It is to Italian Tarocco players that we must give the credit for introducing bidding into Tarot games, even though they lost interest in it, and it was left to others to exploit its potentialities.

The name 'Tarok-l'Hombre' was, quite appropriately, reserved for the three-handed game; the first appearance of the game in the card-game books known to me is in *Der beliebte Weltmensch* (*BW*) published in Vienna in 1795. A very cursory notice of it was appended to the chapter on Taroc in the 1797 edition of *Das neue Königliche l'Hombre*, but the *Spiel-Almanach* (*SA*) published in Berlin in the same year devoted its entire section on Tarok to a long description of Tarok-l'Hombre, a description that was many times reprinted word for word in later card-game books down to 1830. Many other German nineteenth-century books on card-games included Tarok-l'Hombre in their section on Tarok, the majority basing themselves on one or other of the two 1797 accounts.[1] The game must, however, have been played in Germany for quite a long time before it found its way into the card-game books, since both the 1797 accounts distinguish between an older and a more recent mode of play, although *BW* gives only the older form. Indeed, even the older version had evidently undergone some evolution before being challenged by its newer rival, since, as it is described in the books, the hands are not played out when only the lowest bid of *a tre* is made, but are thrown in for a new deal, the declarer being paid the minimum that he wòuld have made if successful. Obviously, no-one would include such a rule in a new form of game when first invented. Originally *a tre* must have been a genuine bid; when experience showed that it was hardly ever unsuccessful, the actual play of any round to which no higher bid had been made was abandoned as uninteresting, a vestigial trace of the original bid remaining. There is no way of exactly dating the introduction of Tarok-l'Hombre into Germany; but it can hardly have occurred much later than about 1770.

---

[1] *Der Meister in allen Kartenspielen*, Hamburg and Altona, about 1810, mentions the game in one sentence. Julius Cäsar, *Neuster Spielalmanach für das Jahr 1800*, Berlin, 1800, has a revised and expanded version of the *SA* account. This is followed, largely or wholly, by: *Neuestes Spielbuch*, Vienna, 1802; *Berliner Almanach für Karten-, Schach- und Pharospieler auf das Jahr 1804*, Berlin, 1804; J. Cäsar, *Spielalmanach für Karten, Schach*, etc., Berlin, 1815; T.F. Müller, *Neuestes Spiel-Taschenbuch*, Ulm, 1830; and S.A. Jorgensen, *Nyeste Dansk Spillebog*, Copenhagen, 1868. Books whose description of the game resembles the brief account in *Das neue Königliche l'Hombre* are: *Taschenbuch aller Karten-, Kegel-, Brett- und Würfel-Spiele*, Lüneburg, about 1805; *L'Hombre Royal*, Vienna and Prague, 1824; *Het Kaartspelen Gemakkelijk Gemaakt*, Amsterdam, 1821; *Allgemeines Karten Spielbuch*, Vienna, 1846; and Alban von Hahn, *Buch der Spiele*, Leipzig, 1894. The *Neuestes allgemeines Spielbuch*, Vienna, 1829, describes five

Tarok-l'Hombre (older version)

Deal and discard

There are three players. A 78-card French-suited pack is used. According to *SA*, deal and play are *clockwise*; save for those which reprint the *SA* account in full, other books leave the direction unspecified. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in five rounds of five cards each, starting with the player on his left, and takes the last three cards for himself. He then discards three cards, which count for him at the end of the round. He may never discard a King, the Scüs or a Tarok (trump).

> *Variant*
>
> The dealer gives the first twenty-five cards to the player on his left, the next twenty-five to the second player, and the remaining twenty-eight to himself. (No account of Tarok-l'Hombre mentions this, but it is alluded to, by way of contrast with the practice in Grosstarock, in the account of the latter game given in von Abenstein's *Neuster Spielalmanach für Karten* (Berlin, 1820), as the standard Tarok-l'Hombre mode of dealing.)

The bids

There are in theory four possible positive bids, which are, in ascending order: *a tre* or *a trio*; *a due*; *a uno*; and *solo*. A declarer who has bid 'Solo' plays on his own against the other two, who are partners for that round, without any further complication. One who has bid 'A uno' first asks for any one card he does not have, and the player who has that card must surrender it in exchange for any card the declarer chooses to give him from his hand. The declarer then likewise plays alone against the other two. A bid of 'A due' is like 'A uno' save that the declarer asks for any *two* cards that he lacks, giving to the player or players who supply them a card from his hand in exchange for each. 'A tre' is again the same, save that the declarer asks for three cards. (In a paragraph added almost at the beginning to its reprint of the *SA* (1797) account, the *Neuster Spielalmanach* (*NSa*) (1800) explains the procedure and scoring for a bid of 'A tre', as if it were a normal bid; the paragraph was conceivably borrowed from an earlier account written at a stage when it was.)

> *Late variant*
>
> S. Ulmann, writing in the 1890s, says that the declarer must pay 10 game points to a player who supplies him with the XXI, and 5 game points to one who supplies him with any other card: this rule is imported from Tarok-Quadrille.

Bidding procedure

When the dealer has discarded, the bidding is opened by the player on his left, who must make a positive bid; he may say 'A tre' before even looking at his cards. The second player may now either pass or make a higher bid. Suppose that he makes a higher bid by saying 'A due'. The first player must now either pass or say *'Ich behalte es'* ('I hold'), meaning that he claims the prior right to become declarer at the level of *a due*. The second player must now in turn either pass or make a yet higher bid; if he does the latter, the first player may, if he wishes, again say 'I hold'. They continue in this manner until one of them

---

varieties of Tarok, of which Tarok-l'Hombre is the only one played with 78 cards; it incorporates the text of *L'Hombre Royal*, but adds a great deal more, much of which appears to be taken from a description of Grosstarock; it is followed by the *Neuestes Spielbuch*, Vienna, about 1830. Other books which give accounts of Tarok-l'Hombre are: F. von Posert, *Zwei und siebenzig deutsche, französische und englische Kartenspiele*, Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1864, *Deutsche, französische und englische Kartenspiele*, 3rd edition, Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1873, and 9th edition, Leipzig, 1901; *Illustrirtes allgemeines Familien-Speilbuch*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1882; Carl König, *Neuster Spiel-Almanach*, Berlin, about 1892; S. Ulmann, *Das Buch der Familienspiele*, Vienna, about 1892; and Albert Stabenow, *Ausgewählte Kartenspiele*, Leipzig, 1908.

passes. If they have reached 'Solo', the bidding is over without the third player having had a chance to bid; otherwise, the third player (the dealer) must either pass or make a bid higher than any so far made. If the third player makes a positive bid, then whichever of the two earlier players has not yet passed has the right, if he wishes, to say 'I hold', or of course may pass; if he says 'I hold', then he and the third player fight it out as before. In every case, a player who comes earlier in the bidding order may claim a prior right, over a subsequent player, to become declarer at any given level. Once a player has passed, he has no opportunity to re-enter the bidding.

Late variant

A. Stabenow, writing in 1908, says that if the first player opens the bidding with 'A tre', he may subsequently say 'I hold' to 'A due' and to 'A uno', but not to 'Solo'.

Note

The bidding procedure is rather carelessly described in the sources: it is not made perfectly clear whether a player, in making a positive bid, is always required to make the lowest one he legally may, or whether he can jump to a higher level than is necessary to remain in the bidding. The probable answer is that the declarer, having won the auction, may if he likes announce a game at a higher level than his last bid; if so, there would be no motive to make a higher bid than necessary at any stage. If this were not so, it would be very foolish for the opening bidder to say 'A tre' before looking at his hand, which *SA* gives as the usual practice. Stabenow is not just copying earlier accounts, and gives German names (*Dreier, Zweier, Einer*) for the three lowest bids; he thus provides testimony that the game was still played at the beginning of this century. We should probably interpret him as meaning that it is possible to open the bidding at any level – at any rate with 'Solo', which will also end the bidding – and to overbid with a jump of one or two levels, but that the declarer may play only at the level of his last bid. The earliest account, *BW*, gives a rather confused procedure. The first player may pass or say '*Entro*'. If he says '*Entro*' and the other two then pass, he has the right either to take the payment for *a tre*, the hands being thrown in for a new deal, or to announce any of the higher contracts; if he does the latter, the other players in turn have the right to make a higher bid, despite having passed previously, the earlier bidder having the right to 'hold'.

Play

If the opening bidder said 'A tre' and the other two both passed, the hands are thrown in, and there is a new deal by the next dealer. Otherwise, as soon as the declarer has asked for and received the cards to which he is entitled, and has given cards in exchange for them, the player to the dealer's left leads to the first trick. The hands are played out under the usual rules; the two opponents of the declarer keep in one pile the cards they win in tricks. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order. The Scüs serves as Excuse; the one who plays it takes it back and gives a low card in exchange for it from among those he or (if he is an opponent) his side has won in tricks, immediately if possible, otherwise as soon as he can; he may do this even in the last trick. If the declarer makes *Tout*, that is, wins all the tricks, the opponents must surrender the Scüs to him at the end of the round. Note that there are no declarations and no Pagat ultimo bonus.

Scoring

At the end of the round, the cards are counted in threes, the counting cards having their standard values; there are thus 78 points altogether. In order to win, the declarer must have 40 points or more on the cards he has won in tricks. Later accounts say that if the declarer has 39 points or fewer, he has lost; but *BW* and *SA*, and the accounts that follow *SA*, say that he loses outright only if he has fewer than 39 points, and is *remis* if he has 39. The difference is terminological only: all are agreed that, if the declarer makes 39 points, he pays the minimum sum (the so-called 'consolation') to each opponent.

The system of payment given in *SA* (1797) and *NSa* (1800) is as follows. If the declarer wins *a tre*, he is paid by each opponent 10 game points (the 'consolation') plus the number of card points he has above 39; if he wins *a due*, he is paid twice this sum; if he wins *a uno*, three times this sum; and if *solo*, six times this sum. Thus if he makes 47 points *a due*, each opponent pays him 36 game points, which is double 10 + 8, since he has 8 card points above 39; if he makes 43 points playing *solo*, each pays him 84 game points, since 84 = 6 × (10 + 4). In practice, however, an *a tre* game is not played out; the declarer is then presumed to have won minimally, and is paid 10 game points by each opponent. If the declarer makes *Tout*, he is paid by each opponent 200 game points if he was playing *a due*, 300 if *a uno* and 600 if *solo*. If the declarer makes 39 or fewer points, he likewise pays to each opponent 10 game points plus the number of card points (if any) by which he is short of 39, multiplied by 2 if he was playing *a due*, by 3 if he was playing *a uno* and by 6 if he was playing *solo*. Thus, if he made 35 points playing *a uno*, he pays each opponent 42 game points, since 42 = 3 × (10 + 4).

There are many slight variations on this scoring system. *BW* reckons the payments for win or loss as 5 game points (consolation) plus the excess or deficit as against 39 points, multiplied by 2 *a due*, by 3 *a uno* and by 4 *solo*: it gives no special payment for *Tout*. *SA* says that some players prefer to add the above payments for *Tout* to the payments reckoned in the usual way, which seems exorbitant. Many of the later accounts say that the excess or deficit of card points is to be reckoned from 40, so that a declarer making 42 points *a due* is to be paid 24 and not 26 game points by each opponent. Carl König, writing in the 1890s, adds to this that for a win when playing *solo*, a declarer is paid by each opponent only 36 game points plus six times the number of points he has above 40, and similarly when he loses. Posert, in a work of 1864, says that some players reduce the payment for *Tout* to 50 game points *a due*, 100 *a uno* and 150 *solo*; but this must be meant to be in addition to the ordinary payment, since otherwise it would be advantageous to lose one trick.

The existence of an earlier stage at which 'A tre' was treated as a normal bid, and the hands played out, is evident from the whole structure of this game – not merely the bidding procedure, but also the system of scoring, under which the score for win or loss *a tre* was obviously simply the consolation plus the excess or deficit of card points. Probably there was no original requirement that the first player make a positive bid; but since it was so easy to win *a tre*, when neither of the other players was willing to make a higher bid, it must have become automatic for the first player so to open the bidding, a practice which hardened into a rule.

The 'later' form of Tarok-l'Hombre, mentioned already in both 1797 accounts, and in *SA* designated a more recent form, was later only in date of invention. To judge by the card-game books, both continued to be played throughout the nineteenth century, and that this is not a mere result of the plagiarism of compilers of card-game books is made probable by the fact that both are still mentioned by Stabenow and by Ulmann, who give signs of having first-hand knowledge. The later form did not differ greatly from the earlier, and was, perhaps, not so good a game; certainly *SA* insisted that it was the easier of the two. But the point on which it differed was a crucial innovation: the extra cards were to go, not to the dealer, but to the declarer; the declarer, not the dealer, was to have the advantage of the discard. Hitherto, in all Tarot games in which any player had the privilege of taking additional cards and discarding, this privilege had always belonged to the dealer; now it was to become one of the incentives to bid. The term *Skat*, previously used for the discard, was transferred to the additional cards, laid aside until the bidding was completed. The importance of this change lay in the opportunities it created for devising new types of bid. The transference of Ombre bidding to Tarot was not easily effected, for in Ombre only twenty-seven of the forty cards are dealt out to the players, and many of the bids are distinguished from one another by what happens to the remaining talon of thirteen cards. At first it did not occur to anybody that anything like the same principle could be applied to Tarot games; and even when the crucial step was taken of assigning the *Skat* to the declarer rather the dealer, it was not at first exploited, since in the later form of Tarok-l'Hombre the *Skat* goes to the declarer irrespective of his bid. But, once this step had been taken, the possibility was open of distinguishing different bids according to the number of cards from the *Skat* the declarer could take for himself, rather than on the principle used in Tarok-l'Hombre and in Italian Permesso and Tarocc'Ombre. This idea was then much imitated in games played with the regular pack, especially in Germany, and it was copied from Tarock rather than from Ombre, in which it was applied rather differently – for example, the player had to discard before drawing from the talon. For an instance of such imitation we do not have to look further than the German national game of Skat, named after this very feature.

Tarok-l'Hombre (later version)

All is as in the older version, with the following exceptions. The dealer takes the top three cards from the pack and lays them face down upon the table. He then gives twenty-five cards to each player in five rounds of five cards each. Bidding begins as soon as the deal is completed. The bid of 'A tre' is entirely suppressed, and the bid of 'A due' treated like that of 'A tre' in the older game: that is to say, if the first player says 'A due' and the other two pass, the hands are thrown in, the first player is paid 20 game points by each of the other two, and there is a new deal by the next dealer. If a bid of 'A uno' or 'Solo' is made, the declarer takes the three cards in the middle of the table, called the *Skat*, without showing them to the others, adds them to his hand, and then discards three cards face down, with the same restrictions as applied to the dealer's discard in the older version of the game; the three discarded cards count to the declarer at the end of the round. After this, if he bid 'A uno', he asks for a single card that he lacks, giving a low card in exchange for it as before. Play then proceeds as in the older version. The scoring is exactly the same, save that, when the declarer plays *solo*, the basic score is multiplied by 5, not by 6; e.g. if he makes 44 points, he is paid 75 game points by each of his opponents, 75 being 5 × (10 + 5). *Tout* is paid 300 game points by each when made *a uno*, and 500 game points when made *solo*. The same remarks about minor variations in scoring apply here as to the older version.

Variant

In one text, the *Allgemeines Karten Spielbuch*, published in Vienna in 1846, it is mentioned that some players add a Misère bid to Tarok-l'Hombre (whether to the older or the later version of the game is not made clear), regarding it as overbidding Solo: the player contracts to make no tricks and is paid the rather small sum of 26 game points by each opponent if he succeeds, and pays them the same sum if he fails. This practice cannot have been widespread.

In the accounts of Tarok-l'Hombre mentioned so far, no provision is made for declarations or for a bonus for making the Pagat ultimo. In the *Neuestes allgemeines Spielbuch*, published in Vienna in 1829, on the other hand, there is a section on Tarok, called 'Tarok in various forms', which begins with Tarok-l'Hombre; Tarok-l'Hombre is the only form of Tarok played with the full 78-card pack that it recognises, the other four forms that it describes being of the later type, played with only 54 or 42 cards, that will be the subject of Part IV of this book. Into the game of Tarok-l'Hombre, as described in this work, many features of the classic three-handed game are incorporated. Since many paragraphs of the account appear to be borrowed from previous accounts of the classic game, it is conceivable that the form thus described had no real existence, but was merely the product of the compiler's running together the descriptions of two distinct games. But it is also possible that such a hybrid form was played in Austria, perhaps as the last Tarok game to be played with 78 cards, after the classic game, in its pure form, had died out.

Tarok-l'Hombre with declarations

This may be played either as in the older or as in the later of the two versions given above, with the following exceptions. If, when the older version is played, the dealer has exactly three Taroks including the Pagat, he may discard all three; some also allow him to discard the Scüs, the Pagat and one other Tarok, if he then has no Taroks remaining in his hand. In no other case may he discard a Tarok; but some play that the deal is annulled if any player has only one or two Taroks in his hand.

Before play begins, and presumably after the bidding has taken place, the following declarations may be made:

Three Matadors (*Mangur* or XXI, Pagat and Scüs) – 10 game points

Ten Taroks – 10 game points

Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 4 game points.

It is not said whether the declared cards need to be shown. Some do not recognise a declaration of ten Taroks; some allot 20 game points to a declaration of the XXI, Pagat and Scüs. Some recognise seven Kings, consisting of the three Matadors and the four natural Kings; some allow a declaration of more than three Matadors, which may be Matadors from below, and in this case the Scüs may substitute for a missing Matador other than the XXI or the Pagat. These latter possibilities are only cursorily mentioned and not explained. Presumably a player making a declaration is paid by each of the other two, irrespective of who is the successful bidder.

If the older version of the game is played, there is not even a nominal bid of *a tre*; and, if the later version is played, there is not even a nominal bid of *a due* (here cited as *a duo*).

The Scüs must be played before the last three tricks. A player who wins the last trick with the Pagat is awarded 10 game points, or, by agreement, some higher premium. The implication seems to be that, when one of the opponents of the declarer makes the Pagat ultimo, he is paid by his partner as well as by the declarer, rather than the declarer's paying both opponents; but this is not made explicit. A player who loses the Pagat pays 5 game points to each of the other two players, or 10 if he loses it in the last trick; this rule is stated expressly in this form, ruling out the possibility that each opponent pays the declarer when the latter captures the Pagat.

There was also a four-handed game with bidding, the bids being closely modelled upon those of Quadrille, the very popular four-handed version of Ombre; in the early texts, it is always compared with Quadrille, and we may conveniently call it Tarok-Quadrille, though the name in just this form does not appear in the sources. The first mention of it is in the 1783 edition of *Das neue Königliche l'Hombre* (*KH*), that is, in an earlier edition than that which first describes Tarok-l'Hombre; it is also described in *BW* (Vienna, 1795), which contained the earliest account of Tarok-l'Hombre. Unlike Tarok-l'Hombre, Tarok-Quadrille was probably not based on any Italian original such as Chiamare il Re, but was an independent application of Quadrille bidding to Tarok. It figures in the two Dutch card-game books of 1821 and 1836, but, apart from those books whose accounts of Tarok are manifestly dependent on *KH*, it does not appear often in the German books. There is an account of it in the *Neustes Spielbuch* (*NS*), Leipzig, 1840, newly written but in part derived from *KH*; and it appears again in some later works, such as the encyclopaedias of von Alvensleben and of Friedrich Anton and Ulmann's *Buch der Familienspiele* and *Illustrirtes Wiener Tarokbuch*. Anton, however, was copying von Alvensleben, who was, in this instance, copying *NS* (1840), so their testimony is of little value. Ulmann is a much more reliable witness, but I am not convinced, in this case, that he was personally familiar with the game he was describing. In fact, I am inclined to think it very likely that Tarok-Quadrille died out by 1850 or thereabouts. It has, however, a number of unusual and interesting features.

Tarok-Quadrille

Deal and discard

There are four players, each playing for himself, and forming temporary partnerships, according to the bidding, for each round. A 78-card French-suited pack is used, from which the Aces of Spades and Clubs are removed, to make a 76-card pack. The direction of deal and play will here be assumed to be anti-clockwise, though this is not explicitly stated. The dealer gives eighteen cards to each player, in two rounds of five each followed by two rounds of four each, starting with the player on his right; in the last round, he takes the last four cards for himself and discards four, which count to him or to his side at the end of the round. He may not discard Kings, the XXI, the Pagat or the Scüs.

Declarations

When the dealer has discarded, the player on the dealer's right makes any declarations he chooses and is able to make. The other players then do so in turn. Possible declarations are:

Ten Taroks – 10 game points.

A complete Cavallerie (all four court cards of one suit) – 10 game points.

A half Cavallerie (any three court cards of one suit with the Scüs) – 5 game points.

All four Kings – 10 game points.

Three or more Matadors (from above) – 10 game points plus 5 game points for each Matador in excess of three.

As in Chapters 11 and 12, the first three Matadors are the XXI, Pagat and Scüs; further Matadors consist of the XX, XIX and so on down in unbroken sequence. By analogy with other games, it is probable that a player holding nine Taroks and the Scüs may declare ten Taroks, but this is not expressly stated. *KH* (1783) recognises a further declaration of three Kings and the Scüs, for 5 game points, but *BW* (1795) and *NS* (1840) rule this out. *KH* probably intends all declared cards to be shown; *NS* does not require ten Taroks to be shown, but the player declaring them must state whether or not he has the Pagat. He need not say whether he in fact has more than ten Taroks. Each player making a declaration is paid its value by each of the other three players at the end of the round of declarations.

Bidding

There are three positive bids, which are, in ascending order: *Frage* ('I ask'); *Mediateur* or *Kauf*; and Solo. No player is obliged to bid, but, having passed, he cannot re-enter the bidding. The bidding is opened by the player on the dealer's right as soon as the declarations have been made and paid for. The bidding procedure is not clearly explained, but probably a player does not have the right to 'hold' a subsequent bid, that is, to claim a prior right to become declarer at that level; the bidding simply goes round in rotation, each player who has not yet passed having either to pass or make a higher bid.

If the declarer has bid Frage, then, when the bidding is over, he 'calls' a King that he does not have: the player who holds that King becomes his partner, but does not announce the fact. No provision is made for the case in which the declarer has all four Kings; perhaps a player with all four Kings may not bid Frage, or perhaps he can call a Queen. If the declarer has bid Mediateur, he will play alone against the other three. Before play begins, he may ask for any one card, other than the Scüs, which he does not have. The player who has it must surrender it, and receive in exchange any card from the declarer's hand that the declarer chooses. In addition, the declarer must pay to the person who supplies the card 10 game points if he has asked for the XXI, or 5 game points for any other card. *KH* and *BW* allow the declarer, if he wishes, to ask for two cards, paying for both, but *NS* does not allow this. If the declarer has bid Solo, he plays alone against the other three without being able to purchase a card.

Variant

Alone of the sources, Ulmann places the declarations *after* the bidding, which makes a great difference; but this may be a mere mistake on his part.

Play

When the preliminaries are completed, the player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out according to the usual rules. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order. When Mediateur or Solo was bid, the three opponents keep together the cards they win in tricks; when Frage was bid, each player keeps his cards separately, since it is not known to all who the declarer's partner is. The Scüs serves as Excuse, and is, when necessary, replaced by a low card from among those already won or subsequently won.

Scoring

At the end of the round, each side reckons the points it has gained on cards won in tricks. The cards are counted individually, assigning to the counting cards their standard values and 1 point to each low card. There are thus 128 points altogether. If both sides have made 64 points, neither pays the other. If Frage was bid, and the declarer and his partner have over 64 points, each receives, from one of the opponents, as many game points as they have card points above 64; if they have less than 64 points, each pays, to one opponent, as many game points as they have card points below 64. If Mediateur or Solo was bid, and the declarer has more than 64 points, he receives from each of the three opponents as many game points as he has card points above 64; if he has less than 64 points, he pays to each as many game points as he has card points below 64.

If a player has declared three or more Matadors during the round of declarations, and later becomes the declarer with a Frage bid, then he and his partner may be able to claim a further payment for Matadors at the end of the round. This will happen if, by taking together the high Taroks they hold in their two hands, which will necessarily be included in the cards they win in tricks, they can form a longer sequence of Matadors than that which was originally declared. They then receive, at the end of the round, 5 game points from each opponent for each additional Matador not included in the original declaration. Suppose, for instance, a player declares four Matadors, having the XXI, Pagat, Scüs and XX; he is accordingly paid 15 game points by each of the other three players. He later becomes declarer with a Frage bid, and his partner proves to have the XIX and XVII, while he himself has the XVIII and XVI. They can then jointly claim payment, at the end of the round, for four more Matadors; each of them will receive, from one opponent, 20 game points.

If a player has none of the first three Matadors in his original hand, but nevertheless undertakes a Mediateur or (as is unlikely) a Solo bid, he is liable to pay the opponents an additional penalty of 10 game points for the three Matadors if he fails to capture the Pagat; this applies even if, playing Mediateur, he asked for the XXI. (Presumably it also applies if he asked for the Pagat but failed to bring it home.) It is not stated whether he also has to pay for any additional Matadors the opponents may have between them. On the other hand, if the declarer at Mediateur or Solo originally had the XXI and the Scüs, and captures the Pagat in the course of play, he may at the end of the round claim from each opponent payment for as many Matadors as he has in the cards he has won in tricks.

Note

In *KH*, the total number of points is correctly given as 128, and a bid is explained as a contract to make, with one's partner, if any, at least half the points. It is later said, however, that the declarer, with his partner, if he has one, will receive as many game points as he has points above 60, or pay as many as he has below 60. Plainly, this '60' is a misprint for '64'; but the authors of many later texts, spotting the discrepancy, have corrected it in the wrong way, by stating quite falsely that the total number of points is 120. The result is baffling if one does not know how the mistake arose.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Tarot in France in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

Apart from Italy itself, and with Switzerland possibly equalling, but certainly not surpassing, it, France is the country in which the game of Tarot has been played for the longest continuous time. It was also the chief source of transmission of the game to other European countries. Even if, as we have seen to be possible, Tarot first entered Germany from Switzerland rather than from France, the mode of play in Germany very quickly became subject to French influences. It was of course from France that the game became known in Flanders, and we have seen that there was French as well as German influence in Holland. It appears to have been from France that the game of Tarocco was reintroduced into both Piedmont and Lombardy in the eighteenth century, so that, although there was direct Milanese influence on the playing of Taroc in Austria, it was a tradition stemming indirectly from France that was thus being transmitted, even if that tradition was, in turn, ultimately derived from Italy, and probably from Milan itself. France is also the country whose cardmakers it probably was that devised *the* classic Italian-suited Tarot pattern, the Tarot de Marseille. We have seen it to be possible that that pattern first assumed its definitive form, not in France, but in Switzerland; but it is equally possible that it did so in Lyons, and, in any case, it was France that became the chief centre for its production. On that pattern were based all those used in German-speaking lands and, from the eighteenth century, in northern Italy: the Tarocco Piemontese, the Lombard pattern and the Tarot de Besançon. Though the Tarot de Besançon almost certainly did not originate in France, it was unquestionably a derivative of the Tarot de Marseille; so France may reasonably be considered the source for the type of Italian-suited Tarot pack used, from the eighteenth century on, everywhere in Europe north of Bologna, with the sole exception of Belgium; and we have seen the distinct pattern used in Belgium also to have been based on a French prototype. For all that, it is not easy to trace the history of the game of Tarot in France. We have the seventeenth-century account of the French game, set out in Chapter 9, and of the Swiss game, probably also played in France, set out in Chapter 10. We have a glimpse of the classic eighteenth-century game, for which we are indebted to de Gébelin. After that, we have no record until the late nineteenth century. This is due to the circumstances, already emphasised, that, from the beginning of the eighteenth century down to very recent times, the popularity of Tarot in France has been strongly localised, confined to the eastern strip of the country, Provence, the Dauphiné, Lyonnais, Burgundy, Franche Comté, Lorraine and Alsace, together with Savoy and Switzerland, in both of which the game was played both in the French- and in the non-French-speaking areas. In all this time, the game remained unknown to those living in the central and western regions of France, and, in particular, to those in Paris, where the writers and publishers of books were principally to be found; and so, despite the wealth of French books on card games from the mid-seventeenth century onwards, the game of Tarot was largely ignored by the compilers of such books throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

For all that, we can gain a fair general idea of its development. We have good ground for assuming that in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the game was played in France in the same general manner as the classic game in Germany. But when we are next able to obtain any evidence about the mode of play in France, we find games more or less closely related to Tarok-l'Hombre, though not called by any such name. The idea of introducing bidding into Tarot games must have entered France from Germany, probably some time in the first half of the nineteenth century; and it has thereafter remained an integral feature of French Tarot.

The French were much slower than other European countries to adopt the new fashion of French-suited Tarot cards – with the exception, of course, of Italy, which has never done so, save in outlying regions like Trieste. In France the French-suited pack did not appear at all until shortly before 1850, and to this day is known as 'Tarot Nouveau'; at Besançon they were still using Italian-suited cards in 1880, and probably up to the turn of the century. The Tarot de Marseille is still manufactured in France, but advertised only for purposes of fortune-telling, and French-suited cards are in standard use for play; for all that, I have heard reliable reports by travellers, one from about fifteen years ago and one from about five, that they have seen people playing (not telling fortunes) with Tarot de Marseille cards.

Tarot has, always and everywhere, been a game whose mode of play is highly localised. Players in different cities or localities do not know each other, and very often do not even know of each other. The game has undergone a long evolution, and particular varieties become frozen in particular places as the local manner of play, or, again, evolve independently of developments elsewhere. By the end of the nineteenth century, there were at least two quite separate traditions of Tarot play in France, one at Chambéry and the other at Besançon and Dijon. Quite possibly there were yet others, which have since vanished; for instance, Pierre Berloquin, in his *Règles du jeu de Tarot*, Paris, 1973, mentions a book called *Le Jeu des Tarots*, by F.S., published in Strasbourg in 1852, which I have not had an opportunity to see. We may begin with the Chambéry version, as described in a booklet, *Le Tarot français*, published at Chambéry in 1902. The players were using a French-suited pack with flowers on the trump cards, and observed an idiosyncratic card order in the suits, the same in all four. The game has several archaic features, including the method of reckoning the points, which coincides with that we have conjectured to have been the original method when the game of Tarot was first invented. It will be remembered that the same method is given in the Dutch booklet of 1846 whose French terminology suggests that it may have been a translation from some French account, or at least a description of a game originating in France (see Chapter 11); so, although the game was entirely different from the Chambéry one, we have some confirmation of its authenticity. The name given to the trump I in Chambéry, *le Baga*, coincides with that which appears, together with names of many other trump cards, in the punning inscription on the Ace of Coins in the mid-seventeenth-century pack by Jacques Viévil discussed in Chapter 9. The principal game played at Chambéry was a five-handed one.

Five-handed Chambéry Tarot

Terminology

Trumps are called *tarots*; the Fool is called *le Fou*; the trump I is called *le Baga*.

Deal and discard

A 78-card French-suited pack is used. Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The dealer gives fifteen cards to each of the five players in three rounds of five each, beginning with the player on his right; in the last round, he takes the last three cards for himself. He then discards three, which count to him at the end of the round; he may not discard Kings, the trump 21 or the Fou. He may discard trumps other than the 21, including the Baga, but only on condition that he has no trump remaining in his hand; if he discards the Baga, he must announce the fact, saying *'Baga à l'écart'*.

Bidding

There are three possible positive bids, which are, in ascending order: *'je marche seul à deux cartes'* ('I play alone with two cards'); *'je marche seul à une carte'* ('I play alone with one card'); and *'je marche à point'* ('I play with none'). The bidding is opened by the player on the dealer's right and continues in rotation. No player is obliged to make a positive bid. A player may make any bid, provided that it is higher than any bid so far made; an earlier bidder has no right to 'hold' a bid made by a subsequent bidder (i.e. to claim a prior right to become declarer at the same level).

If, when the bidding is completed, a player has become declarer *à deux cartes*, he is going to play on his own against the other four in temporary partnership; but, before play begins, he may ask for any two cards, other than the Fou, which he does not have in his hand, and the player or players who hold these cards must surrender them; the declarer then gives any two cards in his hand, other than the Fou, in exchange for them. If a player becomes declarer *à une carte*, he can in the same way ask for any one card he lacks, other than the Fou, giving in exchange any card other than the Fou; he then plays on his own against the other four. If a player becomes declarer *à point*, he plays alone against the other four without asking for a card.

If all five players pass, the dealer 'calls' a King of a specific suit, and the player who holds the King becomes his partner for that round against the other three. If the dealer has all four Kings, he may in the same way call a Queen. Unlike every other Tarot game in which this practice is observed, the player who holds the called King or Queen immediately announces the fact.

Play

The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick, and the hands are played out in accordance with the usual rules. In all four suits, the cards rank, in descending order:

K, Q, C, J, A, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2.

The Fou serves as Excuse: when the player who holds it wishes to play it, he shows it to the other players and puts it with the cards he or his side has won in tricks, but he does not give any card in exchange for it.

Scoring

At the end of the round, the two sides reckon their points on cards won in tricks. They count 1 point for each trick of five cards; the trick to which the Fou was played will contain only four cards, but that, too, counts 1 point; the Fou by itself does not constitute a trick. The dealer or the dealer's side also counts 1 point for the three cards of the discard. In addition, there are added in the points on the counting cards, as follows:

The 21	4 points
The Baga	4 points
The Fou	4 points
Each King	4 points
Each Queen	3 points
Each Cavalier	2 points
Each Jack	1 point

There are thus 68 points altogether (52 points for the counting cards, 15 points for the tricks and 1 point for the discard).

If both sides have made 34 points, no payments are made. Otherwise, the payment for losing, when the declarer bid '*À deux*' or the dealer called a King, consists of as many game points as the point-total of the losing side falls short of 34, or double this amount if their total is less than 17. When the declarer bid '*À une carte*', this payment is doubled, and, when he bid '*À point*', quadrupled. The payment so determined is that made by *each* loser; if there is more than one winner, the payment is divided among them. Thus, if a player has bid '*À une carte*', and wins by making 36 points, he is paid 4 game points by each of the four opponents, thus receiving 16 game points in all; but if he loses by making only 32 points, he pays only 4 game points in toto, each opponent receiving 1 game point. If the dealer calls a King, and he and his partner win by making 38 game points, each of the three opponents pays 4 game points; the total payment of 12 game points is divided between the two partners, each receiving 6. If, on the other hand, they lose by making only 31 points, each partner pays 3 game points; the total of 6 game points is then divided between the three opponents, each obtaining 2 game points. Such a method will, if followed strictly, often give rise to fractional payments, and nothing is said about how to avoid these. The easiest means of doing so is for each of the losers to round up his payment to the next highest multiple of the number of winners: if there are two winners (the dealer and his partner), each of the three losers pays 1 more game point than the excess over 34 points when the latter is odd; when there are three winners (the opponents of the dealer and his partner), each loser rounds up his payment to the next highest multiple of 3; and when there are four winners (the single declarer having lost), the loser rounds up his payment to the next highest multiple of 4.

There were also versions for three and for four players, including some without bidding and some with a shortened pack.

Four-handed Chambéry Tarot

All is as in the five-handed game, with the following exceptions. The dealer gives nineteen cards to each player, in a round of four each followed by three rounds of five each, and takes the last two cards for himself, discarding two. Bidding is as before. When the points are reckoned, each trick of four cards counts 1 point, and the discard of two cards counts 1 point: there are thus 72 points altogether (52 + 19 + 1). To win it is necessary to have gained more than 36 points: the payment is calculated according to the number of points the losers fall short of 36, doubled if they have less than 18.

Chambéry Tarot Croisé

There are four players, in two fixed partnerships, the partners facing each other across the table. There is no bidding. Otherwise all is as in the above four-handed game.

Three-handed Chambéry Tarot

Each of the players plays for himself, and there is no bidding. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, in five rounds of five each, and takes the last three for himself, discarding three. At the end of the round, the points are reckoned, on the basis of 1 point for each trick and 1 point for the dealer's discard, plus the points on the counting cards: there are thus 78 points altogether. Each player with fewer than 26 points pays, in all, as many game points as his point-total falls short of 26, and each player with more than 26 points receives, in all, as many game points as his point-total exceeds 26. However, if a player makes less than 13 points, his payment is doubled; if both other players have more than 26 points, they divide this double payment in proportion to their excess over 26. E.g. if A makes 12 points, B 32 and C 34, A makes a double payment of 28 game points, of which B takes 12 and C 16. Further examples: (i) A makes 12 points, B 10 and C 56: A pays 28 game points, B pays 32 and C receives 60; (ii) A makes 12 points, B 23 and C 43; A pays 28 game points, B pays 3 and C receives 31; (iii) A makes 14 points, B 21 and C 43; A pays 12 game points, B pays 5 and C receives 17. In all other respects, the same rules apply as in the preceding games.

Four-handed Tarot Simplifié

A 62-card pack is used, formed by discarding the 2 to 5 from every suit. In all four suits, the cards rank, in descending order:

K, Q, C, J, A, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6.

The dealer gives fifteen cards to each player, in three rounds of five each, taking the last two cards for himself and discarding two. Bidding is as in the five-handed game, save that the dealer is not permitted to make a bid of '*À deux cartes*'. When the points are reckoned, there is 1 point for each trick and 1 point for the discard of two cards: there are thus 68 points altogether, as in the five-handed game. Payments are therefore calculated just as in the five-handed game.

Tarot Simplifié Croisé

There are four players in fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. The 62-card pack is used. All is as in the preceding game, save that there is no bidding.

Three-handed Tarot Simplifié

There are three players, each playing for himself, and there is no bidding. The 62-card pack is used. The dealer gives each player twenty cards, in four rounds of five each, and takes the last two cards for himself, discarding two. When the points are reckoned, there is 1 point for each trick of three cards, but no point for the discard; counting cards in the discard have their usual values. There are thus 72 points altogether. Payments are made as in the three-handed game with 78 cards, save that the base from which excess or deficit is reckoned is 24 points, and payment is doubled if a player has fewer than 12 points.

Note

In *Le Tarot français*, the general account says that in the three-handed game with 78 cards the discard counts 1 point and there are 78 points altogether. The section on three-handed Tarot with the 78-card pack then says that the discard does not count and that the base score for each player is 24 points. In the above, I have assumed that the description of three-handed Tarot simplifié has been carelessly transferred to the section on the three-handed game with the full pack.

I do not know whether games of this type, which, without bidding, are simply basic Tarot games, and, with bidding, cognate to Tarok-l'Hombre, are still played in or near Chambéry; most likely not. At any rate, it has not been the tradition of play indigenous to Chambéry and Savoy from which modern French Tarot has descended, but, rather, that of Besançon and Dijon, of Franche Comté and Burgundy. This comprised a three-handed and a four-handed game, both involving bidding, and with several peculiarities in common. In both, the cards were counted in twos, yielding a total of 91 points. The rules of play differed from those of all other Tarot games by imposing an additional constraint: in playing a trump, one must, if one can, play a higher trump than any so far played to the trick. This rule makes it more difficult to save the trump I from capture, and correspondingly renders the hunt for it a more skilful operation. Furthermore, both games differed from all other Tarot games in making the criterion of winning more than a simple matter of gaining more points than the opponents. The number of points needed to win depends upon the number of *oudlers* one has in one's tricks, the *oudlers* being the 21 and 1 of trumps and the Fool: with all three, one can win with as few as 36 of the 91 points; with none, one needs as many as 56. The original four-handed game was very similar to Tarok-Quadrille: it had exactly the same set of bids, and the additional cards always went to the dealer. The three-handed game, on the other hand, was more advanced: not only did the talon consisting of the six cards not originally dealt out go to the declarer rather than to the dealer, as in the later form of Tarok-l'Hombre, but the two highest bids were differentiated by whether the declarer did or did not have the right to take them immediately into his hand and then discard six. The old four-handed game is now obsolete: it is the three-handed form from which modern French Tarot has developed, giving birth in the process to four- and five-handed versions.

Since there has been some historical development in these games during the course of this century, it is best to set them out in stages; but we may start by expounding those rules common to all forms.

Basic rules of modern French Tarot

Terminology

Trumps are called *atouts*. The Fool is called *l'Excuse*; the trump 1 was originally called *le Paguet*, later *le Petit*. The 21, the *Petit* and the Excuse are collectively called *oudlers*, or sometimes, more recently, *bouts*. The cards remaining over at the end of the deal, or placed face down in the centre of the table in the course of the deal, form what is known as the *talon*, or, more recently, the *chien*, corresponding to the *Skat* in German.

Rules of play

A 78-card pack is used. Deal and play are counter-clockwise. As usual, it is obligatory to follow suit if possible, including playing a trump if a trump is led; and, as usual, a player who cannot follow suit must play a trump if he can. In addition, when playing a trump, it is obligatory, if one can, to play a higher trump than any so far played to the trick; this applies whether a trump or a plain suit was led. The Excuse of course serves as Excuse; one who plays it is absolved from the duty of following suit or playing a trump. If the trick to which it is played is won by an opponent, it is taken back by the one who played it and placed among the cards he or his side has already won in tricks, any one of those cards being given in exchange for it. It may not be taken back, however, if it is played to the last trick, but is captured by the player or side that wins that trick. There is one exception to this: if the player who has the Excuse, or his side, has won all the preceding tricks, then, in the last trick, the Excuse beats every other card, as if it were the highest trump. The Excuse may be led to a trick; when this is done, the next player may play any card, to which later players have to follow suit if they can, or, if they cannot, to play a trump if they can, according to the usual rules.

Note

Of all the accounts of this game published from 1880 onwards, only one, published in 1977, envisages either the case in which a player plays the Excuse before he or his side has won a trick, or that in which the player who has the Excuse, or his side, wins no tricks. The 1977 text says that, in the former case, the Excuse is retained face up beside the one who played it until he or his side win a trick and can give a low card in exchange for it, and that, in the latter case, the Excuse must be surrendered to the winning side. In default of further information, this may be taken as the general rule, although it would be possible to imagine a rule whereby the Excuse could not be played until the player or his side had won a trick; it would then automatically be forfeit in the last trick, unless that was won by the player's partner.

Scoring

The counting cards have their standard values. Whatever the number of players, the cards are counted in *twos*: there are therefore 91 points altogether. An odd low card counts ½ point. Since there is bidding, there are always, in every round, just two sides. The number of points on cards taken in tricks which the declarer or the declarer's side needs in order to win depends upon the number of *oudlers* there are among the cards won in tricks, as follows:

36 points are needed if there are 3 *oudlers*
41 points are needed if there are 2 *oudlers*
51 points are needed if there is 1 *oudler*
56 points are needed if there are no *oudlers*.

Note that the opponents need ½ point less in each case: e.g. if the declarer's side has two *oudlers*, the opponents must have one; by making 50½ points, they restrict the declarer's side to 40½, in which case the declarer's side has lost.

Bêtes

The game is normally played with a pot, originally called a *bête*, and later a *mouche*, additional to the ordinary payments between players. To prevent the pot's becoming exorbitantly large, there is often more than one *bête* on the table at a time; this is effected as follows. Before the first deal, or at any time at which no *bête* is on the table, the dealer contributes 20 game points, and the other players 10 game points each, to form the first *bête*. Whenever there is a *bête*, or several *bêtes*, on the table before a deal, the dealer adds 5 game points to the largest one. If, in any round, the declarer wins, he takes the largest *bête* on the table, or divides it with his partner if he has one. If the declarer loses, then, if there is only one *bête* on the table, and that has not already been doubled, the declarer now doubles it; there is then still only a single *bête* on the table. If, however, there is more than one *bête* on the table, or there is a single *bête* that was previously doubled, the declarer who loses pays to the table an amount equal to the largest *bête*, that amount forming a new *bête*.

For example, in a four-handed game, the original *bête* will consist of 50 game points (20 from the dealer, 10 from each of the others). If, in the first round, the declarer wins, he takes that *bête*, and the players contribute to a new one, likewise of 50 game points. If the declarer in the second round loses, he doubles that *bête*, and the dealer to the third round adds 5 game points to it, so that there is now a single *bête* of 105 game points. If the declarer in the third round loses, he gives 105 game points to form a new *bête*, to which the dealer to the fourth round adds 5 game points, so that there is now one *bête* of 110 game points and another of 105. Suppose that the declarer in the fourth round also loses: he pays 110 game points to form a third *bête*, to which the dealer to the fifth round adds 5 game points, so that there are now *bêtes* of 115, 110 and 105 game points. If, now, the declarer in the fifth round wins, he takes the largest *bête*, of 115 game points: the dealer to the sixth round adds 5 game points to the largest remaining *bête*, that of 110 game points, so that there are now two *bêtes*, of 115 and 105 game points respectively.

Bonus and penalty

Winning the last trick with the *Paguet* or *Petit*, known as the *Paguet à la fin* or the *Petit au bout*, is always awarded a bonus of 10 game points, while losing it to an opponent in the last trick incurs a corresponding penalty of 10 game points. There are, however, variations in the manner in which this bonus or penalty is paid.

The earliest account of this game known to me is the *Traité du jeu du Tarots* (*TJT*), by M.A., a member of the Cercle Granvelle of Besançon, published in Besançon in 1880, of which a third, unaltered, edition was issued in 1902. This was followed in 1927 by *Le Jeu de Tarots: méthode théorique et pratique* (*JT*), by M.L.A. and the members of the Académie de Tarots of Dijon, and subtitled *Règles générales adoptées par tous les cercles et cafés de la Bourgogne, de la Franche-Comté et de l'Est de la France*. This booklet was published by Bornemann of Paris, and repeatedly reissued by them, at least up to 1967. These two accounts do not differ very greatly. It is best to start with the old form of the four-handed game, given by *TJT* as the only way of playing Tarot with four players, but by *JT*, under the heading *1re méthode, dite ancienne ou d'appel*, as the older of two forms then in current use. It reappears in Pierre Berloquin, *Règles du jeu de Tarot*, Paris, 1973, as a traditional method still practised, though on the wane; but it has probably been little played since the 1930s.

Tarot d'Appel (1880-c. 1935)

Deal and discard

There are four players; a 78-card pack is used. According to *TJT*, even in the 1902 edition, the pack is an Italian-suited one, the Coins suit being called either *Deniers*, as usual, or *Roses*. The cards then ranked in their original order, that is, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, ..., 2, A in Swords and Batons, but K, Q, C, J, A, 2, ..., 9, 10 in Cups and Coins. By the time *JT* was written, however, the French-suited pack had come into use, and, in every suit, the cards ranked K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, ..., 2, A. In *TJT*, the trump 1 is called *le Paguet*; in *JT*, it is also called *le Paguet*, but, for preference, *le Petit*; Berloquin uses only the latter name.

The dealer gives eighteen cards to each player in six rounds of three each, starting with the player to his right. *TJT* allows him, as an alternative, to deal in four rounds only, in any of the following ways: rounds of three, four, five and six each, in that or the reverse order; or rounds of four each and five each alternately, starting with either. Having completed the deal, he has six cards remaining, which form the *talon*; when he has counted these to verify that he has dealt correctly, he takes them into his hand without showing them to the other players. He then discards six cards face down beside him, which count to him at the end of the round. The sources differ slightly over the restrictions on the discard. All agree that it is forbidden to discard a King, the 21 or the Excuse. According to *TJT* and to Berloquin, the dealer may discard the *Paguet* or *Petit* if he has no other trump (the Excuse not counting for this purpose as a trump); in no other case may he discard a trump. According to *JT*, the *Petit* may never be discarded, though there is no prohibition on discarding trumps in general. Berloquin allows any player who has the *Petit*, but no other trump nor the Excuse, to demand an annulment of the deal; the dealer, too, has this privilege if he chooses to exercise it. Neither *TJT* nor *JT* recognises this rule.

Bidding

There are three ordinary positive bids, which are, in ascending order: *appel* (call); *solo* or *achat* (purchase); and *solissimo* or *jouerie*. In an *appel* contract, the declarer 'calls' any card of his choosing that he does not hold; the player who holds this card becomes his partner, but does not announce the fact. *TJT* and *JT* state clearly that if the called card is in the dealer's discard, the dealer becomes the declarer's partner; Berloquin says, on the contrary, that the declarer must, in this case, play alone, paying or being paid by the other three players at the level of an *appel* contract. (Presumably the dealer does not announce that the called card is in the discard; the declarer discovers this only at the end of the round.) In an *achat* contract, the declarer names any suit card that he does not have (not the Excuse or a trump); the player who has this card surrenders it to him in exchange for any card the declarer chooses to give him from his hand. There is the same disagreement here. *TJT* and *JT* say that if the declarer names a card in the discard, the dealer gives it to him in exchange for one of his, which goes into the discard; but Berloquin rules that he does not receive the card he asked for, but has to play with his original hand. The declarer must pay 10 game points to the player who surrenders the card he named; *TJT* recommends instead a price of one fifth of the largest *bête*, while *JT* says that in some places the price is equal to that *bête*, which seems quite exorbitant. The declarer then plays alone against the other three. In a *solissimo* contract, the declarer plays alone against the other three without the benefit of being able first to buy a card.

A player who undertakes an *appel* but inadvertently calls a card he holds, or, if he is the dealer, has discarded, must play a *solo* instead, but is paid or pays only at the rate for an *appel*. Likewise one who undertakes a *solo* and tries to buy a card he already has must play a *solissimo*, but is paid or pays only at the rate for a *solo*.

The dealer is the first to make a bid or pass; the bidding then proceeds in strict rotation. A player is never obliged to make a positive bid; if he does, he must make one higher than any previously made, but need not make the lowest such bid. According to Berloquin, a player making an *appel* bid names the card he is calling as part of his bid, by saying 'J'appelle ...'; likewise, one making an *achat* (*solo*) bid names the card he wishes to buy, as part of his bid, by saying 'J'achète ...'. In *TJT* and *JT*, the declarer in an *achat* names the card he wishes to buy only after the completion of the bidding; they almost certainly intend that the declarer in an *appel* should likewise call a card only after the completion of the bidding, though it would be possible to read them as meaning that he calls it as part of his bid.

Variant

> Berloquin mentions a variant form in which the *talon* is not taken by the dealer, but remains on the table during the bidding. Players who make *appel* or *achat* bids do not name the cards in question as part of their bids. When the bidding is completed, the declarer then takes the *talon*, apparently without showing it to the others. Having discarded, he then calls a card or names one he wishes to buy, unless, of course, he bid *solissimo*.

The three sources differ concerning a *chelem* or slam (making all the tricks). *JT* allows a special bonus for this feat, whether accomplished by two partners or alone, but does not allow it to be made as a bid in this game. *TJT* recognises a special bonus, and also permits *chelem* to be announced in the course of the bidding, in which case it overrides all other bids. The *chelem* thus announced may be played under the conditions of any of the three ordinary bids: the declarer may call a card to obtain a partner, he may purchase a card and then play alone, or he may play alone without purchasing a card. Berloquin distinguishes two types of bid: a *chelem avec appel*, the called card being named as part of the bid, and a *chelem solo*; as a variant, he allows a *chelem avec achat* as ranking between these. It is recalled from the *Basic rules of modern French Tarot* that the Excuse will win the last trick if the player or side that has it has won all the preceding tricks.

Declarations

A player who has ten trumps may, if he chooses, declare them when it is his turn to play to the first trick, and before he does so; the Excuse counts for this purpose as a trump. Berloquin, however, requires a round of declarations, beginning with the player to the dealer's right, before play begins. One who declares ten trumps must show them to the other players; if he has more than ten, he need not say so, and may show any ten. If the one declaring ten trumps is the declarer (successful bidder), he is paid 10 game points by each of the other three players, including his partner, if any, at the end of the round, provided that he has won the round; if he loses the round, he pays the 10 game points to each of the other three. If the player declaring ten trumps is not the declarer, he is paid 10 game points by each of the other players immediately, irrespective of the later outcome of the round. *TJT* and Berloquin also allow a declaration of thirteen trumps, on the same conditions, with a payment of 20 game points; *JT* does not. There is no indication that it is then unlawful to declare only ten trumps having thirteen or more. Berloquin further allows a declaration of eighteen trumps, with a payment of 30 game points, on the same conditions. He also allows one of 'No trumps', by a player having none (the Excuse *not* now counting as a trump), and of 'Misère', by a player having no counting cards, both for a payment of 10 game points: neither *TJT* nor *JT* recognises any of these last three.

Play and scoring

The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. In an *appel*, if the declarer and his partner win, they divide the largest *bête* between them. If they made the exact number of points required for a win (given the number of *oudlers* they have), there is no direct payment between the players; if they obtained more, each receives, from one opponent, as many game points as they had card points above the required total. If they lose, the declarer alone doubles the *bête* (as explained under the *Basic rules*), and, in addition, he and his partner each pay, to one opponent, as many game points as they had card points below the required total. In this and the following cases, the points are frequently rounded up or down to the nearest multiple of 5.

If the declarer plays alone and wins, he takes the largest *bête*, and is paid by each of the three opponents as many game points as he had points in excess of the required total, plus 10 game points if he bid *solo* or 20 game points if he bid *solissimo*. Conversely, if he loses, he doubles the *bête* and pays to each opponent as many game points as he had card points below the required total, plus 10 game points at *solo* and 20 game points at *solissimo*. Berloquin has a different system, however. Under this, a declarer who bid *solo* adds 10 game points to the largest *bête* before play begins, and one who bid *solissimo* adds 20 game points; at the end of the round, the payment by or to the opponents is simply the excess or deficit of the declarer's score in card points as compared with the required total.

According to *TJT*, if a player wins the last trick with the *Paguet*, he or his side will need 10 points less to win: e.g. if they have two *oudlers* in their cards at the end of the round, they need only 31 points instead of 41. This of course affects not only their chances of winning, but also the payments they receive if they do; in the example given, 31 points becomes for this purpose too the 'required total'. Conversely, if a player loses the *Paguet* in the last trick, he or his side will need 10 more points to win: if, e.g., they have one *oudler*, they will need 61 points instead of 51. This practice, called *compter le Petit en dedans*, is mentioned in *JT*, but strongly deprecated. Instead, it is advocated that one should *compter le Petit en dehors*: that is to say, the payment for the round should be calculated in the ordinary way, but 10 game points be added to the payment received, or subtracted from the payment made, by each member of the side that won the last trick with the *Petit* or captured the *Petit* in the last trick. E.g. if a *solo* declarer is to receive 13 game points from each opponent, but one of them captured his *Petit* in the last trick, or won the last trick with the *Petit*, each opponent pays him only 3 game points instead. Or, again, if in an *appel* the declarer and his partner each have to pay 5 game points to an opponent, but one of them won the last trick with the *Petit*, they each receive 5 game points from an opponent instead, although the declarer still doubles the *bête*. Berloquin is neutral between the two systems. He also mentions a variation on the *en dedans* system. Under this, a side that wins the last trick with the *Petit*, or captures it in the last trick, has to make, in order to win: 31 points if they have 3 *oudlers*; 36 if they have 2; and 41 if they have only the one (the *Petit*). (Conversely, if they lose the *Petit* in the last trick, or the opponents win the last trick with it, they must make: 51 points if they have the other 2 *oudlers*; 56 if they have one; and 61 if they have none.) To win the last trick with the *Petit* is called *mener* (or *conduire*) *le Petit au bout*.

The value of a *chelem* is 250 game points according to *TJT* and Berloquin, 200 according to *JT*. According to *TJT*, this is paid whether the *chelem* was announced in the bidding or not, and according to *JT*, it is paid if the *chelem* was made (*JT* does not recognise a *chelem* bid in this game); but Berloquin says that it is paid only if the *chelem* was bid and made. If the *chelem* was made by two partners, each is paid its value by one of the opponents; if it was made by the declarer playing alone, he is paid its value by each of the three opponents. If a *chelem* is bid and lost, and the declarer had a partner, each pays the value of the *chelem* to one opponent; if the declarer was playing alone, he pays its value to each opponent. In all cases where there is a *chelem* payment, points on the cards and consequent payments are ignored. Berloquin says that the *bête* is also left untouched in such a case; *TJT* and *JT* are silent on the point, but probably intend the *bête* to be taken or doubled as usual.

The three-handed game has undergone considerable evolution, particularly in regard to the bidding, from 1880 to the present day. It will therefore be clearest to set it out in several stages, beginning with the game as described in *TJT*.

Three-handed Tarot (Besançon, 1880-1902)

Deal

An Italian-suited pack is used. The dealer gives twenty-four cards to each player, in eight rounds of three each, beginning with the player on his right. The last six cards are placed in the centre of the table to form the *talon*.

Bidding

There are three bids, which are, in ascending order: the simple game or *prise*; the *sans achat*; and the *sans écart*. In all cases, the declarer plays alone against the other two. In a simple game, the declarer, when the bidding is over, turns the six cards of the *talon* face up for the other two players to see. He then takes them into his hand, and discards six, face down, beside him; these count to him at the end of the round. He may not discard Kings, the Excuse or trumps. He then asks for any suit card not in his hand or in the discard, but may not ask for the Excuse or a trump: the player who has the card he asks for must surrender it, and is given in exchange a card from the declarer's hand and of the declarer's choice; the declarer also pays him 10 game points, or, under an alternative convention, one fifth of the value of the largest *bête*. This is called the *achat* (purchase). In a game *sans achat*, the declarer exposes and then takes the *talon*, discarding six cards, as before, but has no right to purchase a card. In a game *sans écart*, the *talon* belongs to the declarer at the end of the round, i.e. he reckons the points in it towards his point-total, but he may not look at it until the round is finished; he therefore makes no discard, and he also has no right to purchase a card. If, however, a declarer has bid *sans achat* or *sans écart*, and becomes the declarer, he may, when the bidding is over, and when, in the case of *sans achat*, he has discarded, announce a *chelem*, i.e. contract to win all the tricks. If he does so, he acquires the right to purchase a card.

The dealer is the first to bid, although it is stated that, among some players, the player to the dealer's right bids first. A player is never obliged to make a positive bid, but, having passed, he may not re-enter the bidding. In order to bid a simple game, a player says '*Je prends*' ('I take'): if the first player to make a positive bid wishes to make one of the two higher bids, he says '*Je prends sans achat*' or '*Je prends sans écart*'. If a player has said '*Je prends*', and a subsequent player wishes to bid a *sans achat*, he says '*Je pousse*' ('I push'). The previous bidder may then, if he wishes, claim the prior right to become declarer at the *sans achat* level: if so, he says '*Je garde*' ('I hold'); if he does not wish to do so, he says '*À vous*' ('Yours'). If he says '*Je garde*', the later bidder may now either say '*Sans écart*' or surrender by saying '*À vous*'. If he bids a *sans écart*, the earlier bidder again has the choice of claiming the prior right to play at that level by saying '*Je garde*' or of surrendering. The same applies whenever a lower bid is overbid by one of *sans écart*, since a player earlier in the bidding order always has the prior right to become declarer at any given level. There is therefore only one round of bidding.

Play

There are no declarations. The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order.

Scoring

The declarer has a certain *required total* he must attain in order to win, depending upon the number of *oudlers* he has among the cards he has won in tricks (see *Basic rules*). This required total is diminished by 10 points if he wins the last trick with the *Paguet* or captures it in the last trick; it is increased by 10 points if he loses the *Paguet* in the last trick, or if one of the opponents wins the last trick with it. If the declarer attains the required total, he takes the largest *bête*; if he does not, he doubles the *bête* (see *Basic rules*). If he surpasses the required total, each opponent pays him as many game points as he has card points in excess of it; if he falls short, he pays to each opponent as many game points as his card points fall below the required total. In either case, an odd ½ point gained by the declarer is ignored. In addition, if the declarer bid *sans achat*, each opponent pays him 10 game points if he wins (reaches the required total), and he pays each of them 10 game points if he loses; if he bid *sans écart*, this extra payment is 20 game points. Whatever the bid, if the declarer makes a *chelem*, announced or unannounced, he is paid 500 game points by each opponent; if he announced a *chelem* but failed to make it, or if he makes no tricks, whatever the contract, he pays 500 game points to each opponent. In either of these cases, ordinary payments between players are suspended, although there is no indication that the *bête* is not treated as usual.

The principal change in *JT* lies in the manner of bidding, although the bids themselves remain the same. The author of *JT* was evidently familiar with *TJT*, whose phraseology he frequently echoes, so that all divergences may be assumed to be fully deliberate.

Three-handed Tarot (Dijon, 1927)

All is as in the preceding form, with the exceptions here stated. A French-suited pack is used; in every suit, the cards rank, in descending order, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, ..., 2, A.

The player to the dealer's right is the first to speak in the bidding. A bid of *sans achat* is always expressed by saying '*Je pousse*'. It is no longer possible for an earlier bidder to claim a prior right to become declarer at a given level: the bidding proceeds in strict rotation, each player who has not yet passed having either to pass or to make a bid higher than any yet made. A player is never obliged to make a positive bid, nor need he make the minimum lawful bid. An announced *chelem* is given as the fourth, and highest, possible bid. The conditions under which the declarer plays when he has bid a *chelem* are not clearly stated: probably they are the same as for *sans écart*, i.e. without purchase of a card or use of the *talon*. (This is suggested, though not entailed, by the remark that it is often dangerous not to overbid a bid of '*Je prends*', because the declarer, with the help of a purchased card, may make an (unannounced) *chelem*, and the further remark that some players have suppressed the bid of '*Je prends*' and, with it, the practice of purchasing a card.)

A declarer who has said '*Je prends*' or '*Je pousse*' may not discard Kings or *oudlers*; he is not forbidden to discard other trumps. When he has discarded, he leads to the first trick, if he is on the dealer's right, or, if he is not, tells the player in that position '*Vous pouvez jouer*' ('You may play'). A player who has fifteen trumps may declare them at his turn to play to the first trick and before he plays a card; the Excuse counts for this purpose as a trump. He must show his fifteen trumps to the other players; if he has more than fifteen, he shows any fifteen of his choice, and does not reveal that he has more. If he is the declarer, then, at the end of the round, if he has won it, each opponent pays him an additional 10 game points; but, if he has lost it, he pays each opponent an additional 10 game points. If he is not the declarer, he is immediately paid 10 game points by each of the other two players.

If the declarer wins the last trick with the *Petit*, or captures the *Petit* in the last trick, each opponent pays him 10 game points. If he loses the *Petit* in the last trick, or one of the opponents wins the last trick with the *Petit*, he pays each opponent 10 game points. These payments are separate from the payments for winning or losing the round, and do not affect the required point-total.

The payment for a *chelem* is 250 game points from or to each opponent.

JT describes a more recent method of playing four-handed Tarot, exactly analogous to the three-handed game, so that in every round (unless all pass) one player plays against three.

Four-handed Tarot (Dijon, 1927)

All is as in the preceding three-handed game, save that the dealer gives each player eighteen cards in six rounds of three each, and a declaration of ten trumps replaces that of fifteen.

The game underwent a further evolution after the Second World War. The earliest account of this new phase was Victor Mornieux's *Méthode moderne du jeu de Tarots*, published at Oullins, which is just outside Lyons, in 1952. Subsequently, several playing-card manufacturers included with their French-suited Tarot packs leaflets giving the rules of the game. Catel's leaflet was anonymous; Héron's was by R.A.C., stated to be a founder member of various Tarot clubs; and that issued, in 1962 according to Pierre Berloquin, by La Ducale, and later by Grimaud, was by P.B.V., honorary President of the Grand Cercle Français de Tarots. Mornieux's booklet and the leaflets describe a third stage of the three-handed game, with corresponding adaptations to four and even five players. An account of this stage is also to be found in Pierre Berloquin's *Le Livre des jeux* (Paris, 1970), and in the same author's *Règles du jeu de Tarot* (Paris, 1973), already mentioned. In this third stage, the bids remain largely the same, although the terminology has changed: apart from the inessential matter of the way the *talon* is dealt out, the principal change lies in the declarations.

Three-handed French Tarot (c. 1950-1970)

Deal

A 78-card French-suited pack is used. Mornieux gives the following terms as used for combinations of court cards of the same suit held in hand: *mariage* (King and Queen); *grand mariage* (King, Queen and Cavalier); *petit mariage* (Queen and Cavalier); *grande cavallerie* (all four); *petite cavallerie* (Queen, Cavalier and Jack). There is no score for having these combinations; they are simply valuable holdings. Deal and play are counter-clockwise, although Berloquin (1973) states that the deal rotates, from round to round, in a clockwise direction. The dealer gives twenty-four cards to each player in eight rounds of three each, starting with the player to his right. In the course of dealing, he puts six cards face down in the middle of the table to form the *talon*. He may, in the middle or at the end of a round of dealing, deal one, two or three cards to the *talon*, but he may never put more than three cards into it at a time, nor may he put any of the first three or of the last three cards into it; apart from this, he may constitute the *talon* in any manner that he pleases. Mornieux, however, requires the deal to be in six rounds of four cards each; one card is dealt to the *talon* at the end of each round of the deal. If any player has the *Petit* but neither the Excuse nor any other trump, the deal is annulled, and there is a new deal by the next dealer. Mornieux does not admit this rule, but gives instead the variant rule stated below under *Bidding*.

Bidding

There are three ordinary positive bids, which are, in ascending order: *'je prends'* (or *'je prise'* in the Héron leaflet); *'je pousse'*; and *'je garde'* (Berloquin expresses this by *'sans écart'* (1970) or by *'je garde sans écart'* (1973)). According to all three leaflets, the only distinction between the first two, the *prise* and the *pousse*, lies in the scoring (see below). Mornieux, however, recognises only the *pousse* and the *garde*, not the *prise*; he calls the declarer the *pousseur*. If a *prise* or a *pousse* has been bid, then, when the bidding is completed, the declarer exposes the *talon* and then incorporates it into his hand; he then discards six cards face down beside him. The discarded cards count to him at the end of the round: he may not discard either Kings or *oudlers*. Berloquin distinguishes between the *prise* and the *pousse* in the same way as in the earlier forms of the game, namely in that, when he has discarded, a declarer who has made the lower bid, *'je prends'*, may ask for any suit card (but not for a trump or for the Excuse) that is not in his hand or in the discard; the player who holds this card must surrender it in exchange for any card the declarer chooses to give him from his hand, and is paid 10 game points for it by the declarer. A declarer who has bid *'je pousse'* does not have this privilege. The practice is unmentioned in any of the three leaflets, and Berloquin agrees that it is falling into disuse.

The *garde* (*sans écart*) is indeed like the *sans écart* of the earlier versions. If the declarer has made this bid, the *talon* is set aside without being looked at; but at the end of the round it belongs to the declarer and counts for him, i.e. he adds the points on the cards it contains to his point-total. According to the Grimaud leaflet, some players admit a bid of *'je garde avec écart'* as intermediate between *'je pousse'* and *'je garde (sans écart)'*; this bid is given by Berloquin (1973) as expressed simply by *'je garde'*, but stated not to be admitted by some players. When it is admitted, it is distinguished from *'je pousse'* (and from *'je prends'* as understood by the three leaflets) only by the scoring.

> *Variant*
>
> Berloquin (1973) gives the following rule as optional; Mornieux treats it as the invariable practice. A player having the *Petit* but no other trump or the Excuse has the option of annulling the deal, but need not exercise it immediately. If, and as soon as, any player bids a *pousse* or higher, the player with the *Petit* may, if he wishes, declare it *imprenable* (uncapturable). The last bidder then has the option of retracting his bid. If he does so, and no one else bids, or if no bid is made higher than *prise*, the player with the *Petit* may annul the deal. If the bid is not retracted, the *Petit* retains its ordinary power as a trump and remains subject to the usual rules governing when it may or must be played; but, if beaten by another trump, it is taken back and a low card is given in exchange for it, as if it were the Excuse. For Mornieux, the holder of a singleton *Petit* has no power to annul the deal immediately, but, since there is no bid lower than *pousse*, does not need it; if there is no positive bid, the deal is automatically anulled, and the same will happen if a bid of *pousse* is withdrawn when the *Petit* is declared *imprenable*, unless the third player chooses to bid.

Berloquin and the Grimaud leaflet recognise two bids, *petit chelem* (small slam) and *grand chelem* (grand slam), higher than the *garde sans écart*, although the other two leaflets do not. The *grand chelem* is a contract to take all the tricks, the *petit chelem* one to take all the tricks but two, in both cases after taking the *talon* and discarding. In a *petit chelem*, the Excuse does not have its special power of winning the last trick (see *Basic rules*). When these bids are admitted, there is no special bonus for an unannounced *chelem*. Berloquin observes that some players do not recognise the *petit* *chelem*, and that others do not admit *chelem* bids at all.

Variant

Mornieux does not recognise *chelem* bids. He admits a special score for an unannounced *chelem*, by the declarer or by his opponents. But he also allows the declarer to announce the intention to make a *chelem* before play begins; this is called a *chelem annoncé* or *grand chelem*. The announcement is made by the declarer's saying '*Je demande le grand chelem*' as soon as he has discarded; he then exposes his hand on the table, and, if the *chelem* is not conceded, leads to the first trick. In a *chelem*, announced or unannounced, the Excuse has its usual power of winning the last trick when the preceding twenty-three tricks have all been won.

The bidding is opened by the player to the dealer's right, and proceeds in strict rotation. A player is never obliged to make a positive bid; if he does so, he must make one higher than any bid yet made, but need not make the minimum such bid. If all pass, there is a new deal by the next dealer. Except when all pass, the bidding ends after two players in succession have passed. The declarer must play at the level of his last bid.

Variants

Mornieux does not allow the player who makes the first positive bid to bid a *garde*; this may be used only as an overbid after a bid of *pousse*. Berloquin (1973) mentions with disapproval the practice admitted by some players of allowing the declarer to announce a higher level than that of his last bid, and with equal disapproval that of allowing the first player to make a positive bid after all have passed on the first round of the bidding.

Declarations

If he so chooses, a player in a position to do so may make any of the following declarations of cards in his hand. According to Mornieux and to the three leaflets, he does so at his turn to play to the first trick and before playing his card. Berloquin (1973), however, requires a round of declarations, starting with the player to the dealer's right, before play begins; the former rule is the traditional one.

Poignée (thirteen trumps) – 10 game points
Double *poignée* (fifteen trumps) – 20 game points
Triple *poignée* (all twenty-two trumps) – 30 game points (Grimaud and Berloquin) or 40 game points (Héron and Catel)
Pas d'atouts (no trumps in hand) – 10 game points
Pas de points (no counting cards in hand) – 10 game points

Mornieux calls a double *poignée* a *poignée d'atouts* or *grande poignée*; he does not recognise a triple *poignée*. For the purpose of the *poignée* declarations, the Excuse counts as a trump. When declaring a simple or double *poignée*, a player must show to the others as many trumps as he is declaring. If he has more trumps than he is declaring, he need not say so, and may choose which ones he shows; but he may show the Excuse as one of his trumps only if he has the exact number that he is declaring. The divergence over the payment for a triple *poignée* may be only apparent, in view of the fact that, when one player is able to make this declaration, the others must be able to declare *pas d'atouts*: perhaps the value of 40 game points is gross, and that of 30 game points net. According to the leaflets, one who holds the Excuse is debarred from declaring *pas d'atouts*; according to Mornieux (who calls it *sans atout*) and to Berloquin, he is not. The *pas de points* declaration (called *misère* by Mornieux and Berloquin) may be combined with *pas d'atouts* or with a *poignée* (the latter combination is called *misère dorée* by Mornieux and Berloquin). Mornieux, the Grimaud and Catel leaflets and Berloquin (1973) all agree that if the declarer (successful bidder) makes any of the *poignée* declarations, he is paid the value of his declaration by each of his opponents, but only at the end of the round, and then only if he has won the round; if he has lost the round, he must instead pay the value of his declaration to each of his opponents. The Héron leaflet omits this rule. Except under this rule, a player making a declaration is paid its value by each of the other two players immediately.

Play and scoring

There is no unanimity about who leads to the first trick. According to Mornieux, the Héron leaflet and Berloquin (1973), it is the player to the dealer's right; according to the Catel leaflet, it is the declarer; according to Berloquin (1970), it is the dealer; and the Grimaud leaflet forgets to say. The first of these rules is surely the more correct. Under Mornieux's rule, the declarer leads to the first trick in a *chelem annoncé*.

What were formerly called *bêtes* are now called *mouches*, but the principle remains exactly the same (see *Basic rules*). According to the Grimaud leaflet, some players omit the addition by the dealer of 5 game points to the largest *mouche* that normally occurs whenever there remains at least one *mouche* on the table Mornieux requires the dealer to add 10 game points, rather than 5, in the latter case; but for him a separate *mouche* is formed on *every* occasion when the declarer, having lost, doubles the *mouche*. The declarer takes the largest *mouche* if he wins, and doubles it if he loses. According to Mornieux, he does neither if a *chelem* was announced or made unannounced; but, for the other sources, the rule applies even in the case of a *chelem* bid. Mornieux describes an alternative system under which the declarer always pays or receives a fixed *mouche* of 80 points; in this case, whenever there is less than this amount on the table, the dealer contributes 40 and the other two players 20 each, and on other occasions the dealer contributes 20.

The name *Paguet* for the trump 1 appears only in Mornieux; the other sources use only the term *le Petit*, which Mornieux says is more usual. There is a bonus of 10 game points for winning the last trick with the *Petit*, and a penalty of 10 game points for losing it in the last trick. The payment of this bonus or penalty is quite independent of the ordinary score for the round, and does not affect the determination of whether the declarer has won or lost the round. A player who has won the last trick with the *Petit* is paid the bonus by each of the other two players, even if he is one of the two opponents of the declarer; likewise, if the *Petit* is captured in the last trick, the player who lost it pays the penalty to each of the other two players, even if he is one of the two opponents and it was the other opponent who captured it. This rule is inferior to the usual one, under which both partners enjoy the bonus or incur the penalty, because it creates a divergence of interest between the two temporary partners. Mornieux, however, gives it as a matter of local custom whether the *Petit* is, in the manner just described, counted *en dehors*, with the payment for the *Petit au bout* (in the last trick) independent of the score for game, or *en dedans*; Berloquin (1973) also recognises the *en dedans* rule as an alternative. Under this latter rule, if the declarer wins the last trick with the *Petit*, or captures it in the last trick, the required point-total which he must attain in order to win is reduced by 10 points; conversely, if he loses the *Petit* in the last trick, or one of the opponents wins the last trick with it, the declarer's required total is increased by 10 points. What happens under this rule when one opponent's *Petit* is captured in the last trick by the other opponent is left unclear; probably it has no effect. The rule has at any rate the advantage of making the two opponents unqualified allies.

Apart from the *mouches*, payments for the round are made between the players as follows. A declarer who has made more points than he needed in order to win is paid by each opponent as many game points as he has points in excess of the required total, and one who loses pays to each opponent as many game points as his points fall short of the required total. In addition, a declarer who wins is paid 10 game points by each opponent if he bid a *pousse*, 15 if he bid *garde avec écart* and 20 if he bid *garde sans écart*; one who loses pays the same sum to each opponent, according to his bid, in addition to his deficit payment. There is no such basic payment in the case of a *prise*. Mornieux mentions this system, but stigmatises it as incorrect. He recognises the basic payment of 10 game points in a *pousse*, with the payment for exceeding or falling short of the required total, so that, in this case, his system is as already stated. But, when a *garde* has been bid, he requires *all* payments to be doubled, making a basic payment of 20 game points, and 2 game points for each excess or deficit point; payments for the *Petit au bout* and for declarations are also doubled, including the payment for a *poignée* made to his opponents by an unsuccessful declarer. (It will be recalled that Mornieux does not admit a *prise* bid.) Berloquin has a different system again. Under this the payments between the players are in all cases equal to the excess or deficit in relation to the required total; but, if the bid was higher than *prise*, then, before play begins, the declarer adds 10, 15 or 20 game points to the largest *mouche*, according as he bid *pousse*, *garde avec écart* or *garde sans écart*.

If the declarer bid a *chelem*, the card points are ignored and payments are at a flat rate; on Berloquin's system, the declarer adds nothing to the *mouche*. A successful declarer is paid 100 game points by each opponent for a *petit chelem*, and 250 for a *grand chelem*; an unsuccessful one pays each the corresponding sum. Berloquin (1970) agrees with these evaluations, but Berloquin (1973) allows only 200 game points for *grand chelem*, while mentioning variant payments of 250 or even 500. If *chelem* bids are not admitted, a declarer who makes *chelem* (wins all the tricks) is paid 250 game points by each opponent; the Héron leaflet recommends an alternative payment of 350 game points. If the declarer makes no tricks at all, he pays the value of the *chelem* to each opponent. Whenever a *chelem* payment is made, other payments between the players for the round are ignored, as is that for the *Petit au bout* (in the last trick) if it is normally counted *en dedans*; payments are still made for declarations and, when it is counted *en dehors* (paid for separately), for the *Petit au bout*. But when *chelem* bids are allowed, the special bonus (or penalty) is paid only when a *chelem* was bid. For Mornieux, the payment for *chelem* depends on whether there are fixed or variable *mouches*. When the size of the *mouche* varies in the usual way, the payment for an unannounced *chelem* is 200 game points, from or to each opponent; but when the alternative system of fixed *mouches* is employed, it is 400 game points. In either case, the payment for a *chelem annoncé*, won or lost, is twice that for an unannounced *chelem*.

It is evident that some confusion occurred during the transition from the old method of bidding recorded in *TJT* to the later and simpler method, in the course of which the original meaning of '*Je garde*' was lost, and it came to be interpreted as a particular bid, usually that of '*sans écart*'. As before, all the sources describe a four-handed game closely analogous to the three-handed one, although the author of the La

Ducale/Grimaud leaflet states firmly that Tarot 'was invented to be played by three people'.

Four-handed French Tarot (c. 1950-1970)

All is as in the preceding three-handed game, with the variations there mentioned, save for the following differences. The dealer gives eighteen cards to each player, in six rounds of three each; on Mornieux's method, the dealer again puts one card in the *talon* after each round of the deal. A simple *poignée* consists of ten trumps, a double one of thirteen and a triple one of eighteen: in the last case, the eighteen trumps have to be shown. There remains the same difference as before in the score for a triple *poignée*, Berloquin and the Grimaud leaflet allotting it 30 game points and the Héron and Catel leaflets 40; this can no longer be explained as a difference between net and gross scores, since none of the other players may be able to declare *pas d'atouts*. If *chelem* bids are admitted, a *grand chelem* is worth only 200 game points; likewise, when they are not admitted, the bonus for an (unannounced) *chelem* is only 200. Mornieux's payments for announced or unannounced *chelem* remain as before. According to the Grimaud leaflet, but not to Berloquin, a *petit chelem* requires winning all the tricks but one. The bidding is the same as in the three-handed game. It will be recalled that Berloquin's two accounts are the only sources to allow a player who bid '*Je prends*' in the three-handed game to purchase a card; he allows the same in the four-handed game. In his 1970 account, he also allows the declarer in a *prise* to call for a partner, if he wishes to do so, instead of buying a card. He does this by saying '*J'appelle ...*' ('I call ...') and naming a suit card that is not in his hand or in the discard (he may not name a trump or the Excuse); the player holding the card thus called becomes his partner, but does not accounce the fact. At the end of the round, each of the two partners is paid by, or pays, one of the opponents. Berloquin (1973) does not admit this possibility; nor does Mornieux or any of the three leaflets: according to them the declarer always plays alone against the other three. On Mornieux's alternative system of fixed *mouches*, each *mouche* is now set at 100 game points.

Berloquin (1973) mentions another form of four-handed game as being occasionally practised, which eliminates the occurrence, frequent according to Berloquin, of rounds in which all four players pass; it is intermediate between the game just described and the older Tarot d'Appel.

Four-handed French Tarot with calling (c. 1970)

All is as in the preceding game, save that the declarer, having made his discard, if any, in every case calls a suit card to obtain a partner, who, as usual, does not reveal his identity. A declarer who has said '*Je prends*' does not have the right to purchase a card. It is legal for the first player to pass, but he will seldom have a motive for doing so. If, in a *garde sans écart*, the declarer calls a card in the *talon*, he plays without a partner.

In this third stage in the evolution of the game, there is also a five-handed form, again analogous to the basic three-handed one, but always played by two against the other three. Mornieux scarcely bothers to describe this form, saying that it destroys all the subtlety of the game.

Five-handed French Tarot (c. 1950-1970)

All is as in the preceding four-handed game, with the following exceptions. The dealer gives fifteen cards to each player, in five rounds of three each, and, in the course of the deal, constitutes a *talon* of three cards only. The bidding is the same as before; Berloquin allows the declarer in a *prise* to purchase a card, but the three leaflets do not. The declarer, having made his discard, if any, calls a King that he does not have; if he has all four Kings, he calls a Queen. The player who has the called King or Queen becomes his partner, but does not announce the fact. If, in a *garde sans écart*, the declarer calls a card in the *talon*, he plays without a partner. A simple *poignée* consists of eight trumps, a double one of ten and a triple one of fifteen; there is the same disagreement over whether the latter is worth 30 or 40 game points. A *petit chelem*, if admitted, requires winning every trick but one. At the end of the round, if the declarer and his partner win, they divide the *mouche* between them, and each of the three opponents pays the amount stated for the three-handed game; the two partners divide these payments between them. If the declarer and his partner lose, they share between them in paying to each opponent the amount stated for the three-handed game; Berloquin (1973) states that only the declarer doubles the *mouche* (the leaflets are not explicit about this, but merely say generally that the two partners share equally in winnings or losses). The fixed *mouche* in Mornieux's alternative system will now be of 120 game points.

As was noted in Chapter 10, the game of Tarot is still played, with a French-suited pack, in certain French-speaking areas of Switzerland, the canton of Fribourg and some villages in the Jura, in a manner closely resembling modern French Tarot. A leaflet in French issued by the playing-card firm of AG Müller gives the three-handed game as the principal form. Another leaflet in French, lent to me by Mr Jim Simons, has a different text, but describes precisely the same game; it came from a French-suited Tarot pack, of the kind used in both France and Switzerland, whose manufacturer is unfortunately not known. Entitled *Règle du jeu de Tarot*, it will be referred to as the RJT leaflet. The game has a few differences from the French game just described, notably the more severe restriction on the discard.

Modern Swiss three-handed Tarot

A 78-card French-suited pack is used. The game is like the preceding three-handed French one (*c.* 1950-70), with the following exceptions.

Bidding

The bids are: *'je prends'*, *'je pousse'*, *'je garde'*, *'petit chelem'* and *'grand chelem'*. In a *prise* or *pousse*, the declarer may not discard either *oudlers* or *any* court card. There is no right of *achat* (asking for a card held by another player) in a *prise* contract. The Excuse has its special power of winning the last trick in a *petit chelem* contract as well as in a *grand chelem*; as in the French game, the former is an undertaking to win all the tricks but two. The variant rule about a player holding the *Petit* but no other trump does not apply: the deal is automatically annulled in this case (the Excuse counting for this purpose as a trump).

Declarations

These are as in the preceding French game, the value of a triple *poignée* being 30 game points, and possession of the Excuse debarring a player from declaring *pas d'atout*. The declarations are made by each player before he plays to the first trick. If the declarer makes a *poignée* declaration, he is paid at the end of the round provided that he has fulfilled his contract, but, if he has failed, he pays each opponent for the *poignée*.

Play

Although deal and play are counter-clockwise, and the player to the dealer's right opens the bidding, it is the player to the *left* of the *declarer* who leads to the first trick.

The system of *mouches* is as under the *Basic rules of modern French Tarot* above. A player who wins the last trick with the *Petit* is paid 10 game points by each of the other two players, irrespective of whether he is the declarer or an opponent; if he loses the *Petit* in the last trick, he pays 10 game points to each of the other two.

The scoring system is as usual: if a player fulfils his contract, he takes the largest *mouche*, and is paid by each opponent as many game points as he has card points in excess of his required total, plus 10 game points in a *pousse* contract and 20 game points in a *garde*; if he loses, he pays to the table an amount equal to the largest *mouche*, and to each opponent as many game points as he fell short of the required total of card points, plus 10 game points for *pousse* and 20 for *garde*. If a *chelem* was bid, the card points are ignored: the value is 100 game points for a *petit chelem* and 250 for a *grand chelem*, for win or loss; there is no special payment for an unbid *chelem*.

Variants

The RJT leaflet gives a few variants of a familiar kind. These are:

(i) There is no prohibition on putting any of the first three or the last three cards of the pack into the *talon*.

(ii) A bid of *'je garde avec écart'* is recognised, higher than *'je pousse'* and lowe than *'je garde'*; the declarer takes the *talon*, as in a *pousse*, but the basic payment is 15 game points.

(iii) The contribution of the dealer to the original *mouche*, or when no *mouche* remains, is of only 10 game points, like that of the other two players.

(iv) The contribution of 5 game points by the dealer to an existing *mouche* is suppressed.

(v) The size of the *mouche*, as gained by or paid by the declarer, is invariable.

The game is also played by four.

Modern Swiss four-handed Tarot

All is as in the three-handed game, with the following exceptions. The dealer gives only eighteen cards to each player, again three at a time. As in the French game, a *poignée* now consists of ten trumps, a double one of thirteen and a triple one of eighteen. A *grand chelem* is worth 200 game points, a *petit chelem*, gained by winning all the tricks but one, 100 game points: but the Excuse retains its power of winning the last trick in a *petit chelem* contract. The declarer plays alone against the other three in all contracts.

The RJT leaflet recognises also a five-handed form.

Modern Swiss five-handed Tarot

All is as in the three-handed game, with the following exceptions. The dealer gives only fifteen cards to each player, again three at a time; the *talon* consists of only three cards. As in the French game, a simple *poignée* consists of eight trumps, a double one of ten and a triple one of fifteen. Again as in the French game, the declarer, after he has made his discard, if any, calls a King that he does not have in order to obtain a partner; if he has all four Kings, he calls a Queen. The declarer and his partner, who, as usual, does not declare himself, share between them the payments made by or to their opponents. A *grand chelem* is worth 200 game points, a *petit chelem*, gained by winning all the tricks but one, 100 game points; the Excuse retains its power of winning the last trick in a *petit chelem* contract.

The game of Tarot, in the form previously played in Dijon, Besançon and, to judge from Victor Mornieux's booklet, Lyons, has, since the Second World War, become popular all over France; Mornieux remarked in 1952 that Tarot used to be played chiefly in the provinces near to Switzerland, but was now spreading to other parts of the country. The story nowadays accepted and retailed by everyone is that this is due to the Algerian war. Parcels of clothing and comforts were sent to the French troops there, and these frequently included Tarot packs with leaflets giving the rules of the game; soldiers formerly quite unfamiliar with it learned the game from these leaflets, and, when they were demobilised, took it back with them to all parts of France. Berloquin (1973) attributes a similar effect to the Franco-Prussian War and the First World War. This seems dubious, since, so far as I know, there is no evidence that the game spread beyond the eastern regions before the Second World War. But, whether the explanation concerning the Algerian war is well founded or a piece of popular mythology, it is certain that Tarot now enjoys a wide popularity, and, for the first time since the beginning of the eighteenth century, is no longer confined to the eastern parts of the country, but is played everywhere. There are Tarot clubs in Paris and in many other cities and towns; a Fédération Française de Tarot was founded in 1973 with headquarters in Boulogne; national and local tournaments are organised; the sale of French-suited Tarot packs increases year by year; in any small town such packs are readily obtainable, and the game may be seen being played in cafés and bars. French Tarot has, in the present decade, gone into a nova state, and France is probably the only country where Tarot playing is on the increase rather than on the wane.

Since the leaflets were composed, the game has undergone yet further modification. Although it is one of the objectives of the Fédération to achieve uniformity in the rules, such uniformity is very far from being attained. Any distinction between different forms or stages of a game in a process of rapid evolution and with a wide range of variation is necessarily somewhat arbitrary; but I am taking as the criterion for the fourth and latest stage of the game the admission of a bid, the *garde contre le chien*, in which the *talon*, now called the *chien* (dog), belongs at the end of the round to the opponents and not to the declarer, and it is for this reason that I classified the two accounts by Pierre Berloquin as relating to the third stage. It seems probable that the new developments have arisen among players in areas where the game has not been traditional. Sources for the contemporary game are: Patrick Arnett, *Trois jeux, trois jours* (Paris, 1975), which deals with the games of Tarot, Barbu and Gin Rummy, and of which the Tarot section has subsequently been issued separately as *Le Tarot* (Paris, 1977); Claude-Marcel Laurent, *Le Jeu de Tarots: règle et pratique* (Paris, 1975), which is the new Bornemann booklet to replace *JT*; and a large book by Michel Debost, Jean Berthier and Paul Dumas, *L'Art du Tarot* (Grenoble, 1977) (*AT*) which gives a comprehensive discussion of the strategy of play. There is also a leaflet issued by the Fédération in 1974 giving rules for the four-handed tournament game; this is reprinted by both Arnett and Laurent. An organisation called Brain Games, based in Huddersfield, issued in 1975 a leaflet by Paul Simpkins called *The Game of Tarot: Rules*, based on experience of playing the game in Douai. Furthermore, the Spanish playing-card firm of Fournier include a leaflet, whose English version is oddly entitled *The New game of Tarock*, with a French-suited pack; the leaflet claims to present the 'official rules of the game according to the European Federations', but in fact describes contemporary French Tarot. Because it is doubtful whether it has any independent authority, this leaflet will be referred to separately at the end of the following account. All these texts treat the four-handed game as basic, save for Simpkins, who accords this position to the five-handed version. Mr John McLeod has also communicated to me his observations, from two different occasions of playing Tarot with French players, on one of which I also took part. In the following account, the main text will give what seems to be the typical rule, or that common to most sources, with alternatives stated as variants; but in some cases the divergence is too great for this, and then the various alternative rules will be listed as 'Variations', without any standard rule in the main text.

Contemporary four-handed French Tarot

Terminology

The *talon* is called the *chien*, the *oudlers* are often called *bouts* and the declarations are called *incidences*.

Deal

Deal and play are counter-clockwise as usual. The dealer gives eighteen cards to each player, in six rounds of three each, starting with the player next in rotation to himself.

Variants

(i) Simpkins, alone of the sources, specifies that deal and play be clockwise.

(ii) Arnett allows the dealer, at his discretion, to deal in nine rounds of two each.

In the course of the deal, the dealer constitutes a *chien* of six cards face down in the centre of the table.

Variations

(a) Laurent and the F.F.T. rules prohibit putting any of the first three or the last three cards into the *chien*; they also require the dealer to put only one card at a time into it, at his discretion.

(b) Arnett imposes the same prohibition on using the first or last three cards, but states the usual method as being to deal two cards to the *chien* at the end of each of the first three rounds of the deal.

(c) Simpkins requires the cards to be dealt to the *chien* three at a time, at the dealer's discretion.

(d) *AT* lays down that the dealer puts one card into the *chien* at the end of each of the six rounds of the deal.

Variant

Arnett and the F.F.T. rules state that if any player has the *Petit* but no other trump nor the Excuse, the deal is annulled. *AT* says that a player with such a singleton *Petit* has the option of annulling the deal if he wishes.

Bidding

The bidding is opened by the player next in rotation to the dealer, and proceeds in strict rotation; each player must either pass or make a bid higher than any yet made, and none is obliged to make a positive bid. If all four pass, there is a new deal by the next dealer. Provided that all four have spoken, the bidding ends when three players in succession have passed.

Variant

AT lays down that each player has only one chance to bid, so that the bidding ends when each has spoken once.

The possible positive bids, in ascending order, are:

- *petite* or *prise*;
- *pousse* (or, according to McLeod, *pouce* (thumb), an obvious corruption);
- *garde*;
- *garde sans le chien*; and
- *garde contre le chien*.

The *prise*, *pousse* and *garde* contracts differ only in the payments involved (see *Scoring*). In all of them, the declarer turns the *chien* face up and then adds it to his hand and discards six cards at his choice, which count to him at the end of the round: he may not discard a King or a *bout*. In a *garde sans le chien*, the *chien* is set aside without being looked at, but counts at the end of the round to the declarer; in a garde *contre le chien*, it is also set aside, but counts at the end of the round to the opponents.

Variants

(i) The F.F.T. rules suppress the *pousse* bid; *AT* suppresses the simple *garde*, which comes to the same thing. In one of the games observed by McLeod, *garde sans le chien* was not admitted.

(ii) Arnett prohibits the discard of a trump. *AT* says that it is forbidden unless unavoidable, in which case the declarer must announce to the other players the number, but not the rank, of the trumps he has discarded.

(iii) Laurent allows any player, as part of the bidding, to double (*contrer*) another's bid; unless another positive bid is made, this of course has the effect of doubling payments on the round, for win or loss. Laurent is the only authority to allow doubling in French Tarot. More suprisingly, if a bid has been doubled, he allows any *other* player, not the one who made the bid, to redouble (*surcontrer*), thus quadrupling the value of the round. (That this is really his intention is shown by an example.)

(iv) McLeod reports the admission, in both games in which he took part, of the special rule given by Mornieux and by Berloquin (1973) allowing the holder of a singleton *Petit* to declare it *imprenable* (uncapturable). This rule was stated as a variant under *Bidding* in the preceding three-handed French game (see above).

There is no unanimity whatever in the matter of *chelem* (slam); the various alternative rules are listed as variations.

Variations

(a) The F.F.T. rules permit *grand chelem* as a bid higher than *garde contre le chien*; the declarer takes the *chien* and discards, leads to the first trick, and fulfils his contract if he wins all the tricks. The F.F.T also allows a bonus, smaller than that for a successful *chelem* bid, for winning all the tricks having made a lower bid.

(b) Laurent agrees with the F.F.T. rules, save that, when (*grand*) *chelem* has been bid, the lead to the first trick is as usual made by the player to the dealer's right.

(c) Arnett does not admit a *chelem* bid, but allows the declarer to announce *grand chelem* having made his discard, if any: he grants a bonus for *chelem* only if it has been so announced. If such an announcement has been made, the declarer leads to the first trick.

(d) *AT* admits no *chelem* bids, but allows the declarer to announce either *petit chelem* or *grand chelem* just before he plays his card to the first trick. *Grand chelem* is as usual a contract to take all the tricks; *petit chelem* one to take all the tricks but one, the Excuse not then having its special power of winning the last trick (see *Basic rules*). (Note that a declarer who has the Excuse and expects to lose a trick to, say, the 21 or the 20 cannot announce *petit chelem* unless the card in question is played to the first trick before his turn to play, in which case he may announce *petit chelem* and play the Excuse to the first trick.) There is no special bonus for an unannounced *chelem*, but, if one side makes all the tricks, the other side forfeits the Excuse if they had it; the declarer does not forfeit his discard (or the *chien*) if the opponents make all the tricks.

(e) Simpkins admits no *chelem* bids, but allows an announcement of *petit chelem* or of *grand chelem* before the tenth trick; a *petit chelem* is won if the declarer makes all the tricks save one, or all save two if he has the Excuse. There is again no bonus for an unannounced *chelem*. (The rule is stated for the five-handed game, and it is possible that in four-handed Tarot the limit for announcing *chelem* should be later, say before the twelfth trick.)

Declarations

Declarations of cards held in hand may be made by any player in a position to do so just before he plays his card to the first trick; they are never obligatory.

Variant

Simpkins, alone of the sources, specifies a round of declarations before the lead to the first trick.

There are usually five possible declarations, a *poignée* or *petite poignée* of ten trumps, a double *poignée* or *grande poignée* of thirteen trumps, and a triple *poignée* of fifteen trumps (note the reduction in the last case from the number of eighteen trumps required in the four-handed form in the third stage of the game). Simpkins still demands eighteen trumps for the triple *poignée*, however, while *AT* admits four *poignée* declarations, the highest of eighteen trumps; McLeod reports a game in which eleven trumps were required for a simple *poignée*. A player making a *poignée* declaration must show trumps to the number he is declaring; he may count the Excuse as a trump for this purpose, but may show it only if he has the exact number that he is declaring. *AT*, in an example, admits the legality of making a lower *poignée* declaration than one is entitled to. The other two declarations usually admitted are those of *pas d'atouts* (no trumps) and *pas d'honneurs* (no counting cards); *AT* and McLeod, however, replace the latter by the less demanding *pas de cartes habillées* (no court cards). One who makes one of these last declarations, generically known as *misère* declarations, does not, of course, have to show his hand; and *AT* allows him simply to say '*Misère*' without specifying whether he is declaring 'no trumps' or 'no court cards', though this will fairly quickly become apparent in the course of play. A player who has the Excuse may not declare 'no court cards', according to *AT*; possession of the Excuse likewise debars a player from declaring 'no trumps', according to *AT*, Arnett and Simpkins, whereas Laurent and the F.F.T. rules expressly state that it does not. The various admissible declarations, with their values in game points, are tabulated at the top of the next page.

It is permissible to combine a declaration of 'no counting cards' or 'no court cards' with one of 'no

	AT	*F.F.T.*	*Laurent*	*Arnett*	*Simpkins*	*McLeod*
10 trumps	10	20	20	10	10	–
11 trumps	–	–	–	–	–	10
13 trumps	20	30	30	20	20	20
15 trumps	30	40	40	30	–	30
18 trumps	40	–	–	–	40	–
no trumps	10	10	10	10	10	10
no counting cards	–	10	10	10	10	–
no court cards	10	–	–	–	–	10

trumps' or with a *poignée*; *AT* remarks that many players suppress the *misère* declarations.

The payment for declarations is made at the end of the round. The *misère* declarations are intended as compensation for a poor hand, and so they benefit the individual player, who receives the value of his declaration from each of the other players including the declarer. There is disagreement concerning payment for *poignée* declarations.

Variations

(a) For Simpkins and the F.F.T. rules, payment for a *poignée* declaration is personal and independent of the outcome of the round. One who made such a declaration, whether he is the declarer (successful bidder) or an opponent, is paid its value at the end of the round by each of the other three players, whether the round was won or lost by the declarer.

(b) Laurent and Arnett follow the traditional rule that if the declarer (successful bidder) declares a *poignée*, he is paid its value by each of the opponents at the end of the round, but only on condition that he won; if he lost the round, then instead he pays the value of the *poignée* declaration to each of the three opponents. If an opponent made a *poignée* declaration, on the other hand, he is paid personally by each of the other three players whatever the outcome of the round.

(c) *AT* extends the principle of the solidarity of the opponents to all declarations of ten or more trumps. If the declarer made such a declaration, then, as under (b), he is paid by each of the opponents if he wins the round and pays each of them if he loses it. If an opponent makes such a declaration, then, if the declarer loses the round, he alone pays the value of the declaration, and pays it to *each* of the opponents; if, on the other hand, the declarer wins the round, each of the opponents pays the value of the declaration to him.

Play

The lead to the first trick is made by the player next in rotation to the dealer, i.e. the player to the dealer's right except when play is clockwise; under the rule given by the F.F.T. and by Arnett (see under *Bidding*), there is an exception when a *grand chelem* has been bid or announced, the declarer leading to the first trick in this case.

Variant

Simpkins lays down the unusual rule that the lead to the first trick is to be made by the first player to have made a positive bid.

Play is in accordance with the *Basic rules of modern French Tarot* (see above). There is a bonus for winning the last trick with the *Petit* and a penalty for losing it in the last trick. The bonus or the penalty is always paid independently of the outcome of the round, but there remains a divergence of interpretation.

Variations

(a) According to Laurent, the bonus or the penalty is *personal* to the player who has the *Petit*. If he wins the last trick with the *Petit*, then, whether he is the declarer or an opponent, each of the other three players pays him the bonus. Conversely, if he loses the *Petit* in the last trick, he pays the penalty to each of the other three. This should logically imply that if one opponent loses the *Petit* in the last trick to another opponent (which will, indeed, very rarely happen), the player who lost it should pay each of the other three; but this is not explicitly stated.

(b) *AT* maintains the principle of the solidarity of the opponents. The declarer is paid by each opponent if he either wins the last trick with the *Petit* or captures the *Petit* in the last trick; and he pays each opponent if any of them wins the last trick with the *Petit* or if he loses the *Petit* to one of them in the last trick. If one opponent then captures the *Petit* from another in the last trick, there is neither bonus nor penalty. (The F.F.T. rules seem to agree with this, though the text is ambiguous.)

(c) For Arnett, only the declarer can gain the bonus or incur the penalty. If he wins the last trick with the *Petit*, each opponent pays him, and if he loses the *Petit* in the last trick, he pays each opponent; but if an opponent plays the *Petit* to the last trick, there is neither bonus nor penalty.

As on several of the points concerning which there is variation, the best rule seems to be that given by *AT*.

Scoring

The payments for declarations have already been stated; their size is unaffected by the contract undertaken by the declarer.

If the declarer wins the round, he is paid by each opponent, and if he loses it, he pays each opponent. In both cases, the payment each player makes to or receives from the declarer has two components: the base value of the contract, and an amount proportional to the difference between the declarer's actual point-total and the total he required in order to win, given how many *bouts* were in his tricks. The detailed scores differ greatly from one account, or circle of players, to another, but there is only one distinction of principle, according to whether or not there is a multiplier. The successful declarer of a *prise* always receives from each opponent, besides the base value, as many game points as he had points above the required total, and the unsuccessful one likewise pays to each the base value plus as many game points as his point-total fell short of the required one. In the scoring systems of *AT*, Simpkins and McLeod, the same is true for other contracts. But in the systems of Arnett, Laurent and the F.F.T., the amount in game points that the declarer receives from each for an excess over the required total, or pays to each for a deficit, is equal to that excess or deficit multiplied by a number (the multiplier) depending on his contract. This multiplier is always equal to the ratio of the base value of the contract to the base value of a *prise*. When there has been a bid or announcement of *petit* or *grand chelem*, or there is a special payment for an unannounced *grand chelem*, then, whether the *chelem* has been won or lost, the point-total is ignored and there is a fixed payment from or to each opponent.

The scoring systems are in detail as in Table 1 below.

'McL(1)' and 'McL(2)' designate systems adopted by different French players as reported by John McLeod. The base value is always unaffected by the multiplier, which applies only to the excess or deficit score. This latter score is, in the McL(1) system, rounded to the nearest multiple of 5; Laurent states that this is often done, before the multiplier is applied. Simpkins says that it should be rounded to the nearest multiple of 10, but does not say whether 5 is rounded up or down. Others reckon the exact amount. McLeod did not learn the *chelem* scores; in the other sources, these are as given in Table 2 below. In this table, the heading 'Sim(1)' designates the scoring for *chelem* as given by Simpkins, and 'Sim(2)' an alternative system stated by him as used by some players.

It will be apparent from these two tables that something approaching complete chaos prevails at present in the scoring system of this game. It will come as a relief to learn that the *Petit au bout* (in the last trick) is universally recognised as being worth 10 game points. Even here, however, there is disagreement: in the systems of Laurent and of the F.F.T., the score for the *Petit au bout* is subjected to the multiplier according to the contract, each payment being of 20 game points when the multiplier is 2, and so on; when *grand chelem* has been bid, the multiplier should logically be 24 in the F.F.T. system and 40 in that of Laurent, but nothing is said by either about the *Petit au bout* in the case of a *chelem*. In the systems with no multiplier, the value of the *Petit au bout* remains fixed at 10 game points. Arnett also gives it a fixed value: the declarer is paid 10 game points by each opponent if he wins the last trick with the *Petit*, but pays each of them 20 game points if he loses it in the last trick.

In the F.F.T. rules, it is stated that there are no *mouches* in tournament games. Simpkins also omits all mention of them. Berloquin (1973) remarks indignantly that many players, principally in the West and in regions far from the traditional home of

Table 1

	F.F.T.		*Laurent*		*Arnett*		*AT*	*Simp.*	*McL(1)*	*McL(2)*
	base	*mult.*	*base*	*mult.*	*base*	*mult.*				
prise	25	1	25	1	10	1	0	10	0	10
pousse	–	–	50	2	20	2	10	20	20	20
garde	50	2	100	4	40	4	–	40	40	30
garde sans le chien	100	4	200	8	80	8	50	80	80	–
garde contre le chien	150	6	300	12	120	12	100	160	160	50

Table 2

	F.F.T.	*Laurent*	*Arnett*	*AT*	*Sim(1)*	*Sim(2)*
unannounced *grand chelem*	300	500	–	–	–	–
petit chelem announced	–	–	–	150	800	200
grand chelem bid or announced	600	1000	1000	250	1600	300

Tarot, suppress the *mouches* and thereby 'denature' the game. All the other sources provide for them, however; exactly the system described above under the *Basic rules* is specified by Laurent. Under this, at the start of play, and whenever there are no *mouches*, the dealer contributes 20 game points and each of the other players 10; whenever there is a *mouche*, the dealer adds 5 game points to the largest. A successful declarer takes the largest *mouche*. If there is only one *mouche*, which has not yet been doubled, an unsuccessful declarer doubles it; if there is more than one *mouche*, or one that has already been doubled, he pays as much as in the largest *mouche* to form a new one. A number of variants are described.

Variants

(i) *AT* gives the same initial contributions, but, when there is already a *mouche*, the dealer adds 10 game points to the largest one. A *mouche* is never doubled; the payment by an unsuccessful declarer forms a new *mouche* in all cases, and is equal to the largest existing *mouche*.

(ii) Arnett gives the initial contributions as 10 game points from the dealer, and 5 from each of the other players; when there is a *mouche*, the dealer adds 5 game points. On the other hand, the *mouche* is never split; there is never more than one, which could obviously quickly grow very large.

(iii) According to McLeod, the initial contribution is only 10 game points, from the dealer alone; the dealer adds 10 game points to an existing *mouche* only when all passed in the last round. An unsuccessful declarer's payment forms a new *mouche* whenever it is of 100 game points or more.

(iv) Laurent gives several variants. Some suppress the 5 game points added by the dealer to an existing *mouche*; among some the initital contribution is of 10 game points from each player, including the dealer; sometimes it is of 10 game points from the dealer alone, as in (iii). Some impose a fixed payment to the table from an unsuccessful declarer.

Note

The rules given in the Fournier leaflet referred to above are as follows. The *chien* is constituted two cards at a time, at the dealer's discretion; none of the first three or the last three cards of the pack may be put into it, but the players may agree not to observe this rule. If all four players pass, there is a new deal by the *same* dealer. The lead to the first trick is always made by the player to the right of the *declarer*, even when *grand chelem* has been bid. With this exception, the rule governing *chelem* is as given by Laurent. *Pas d'atouts* may not be declared by a player holding the Excuse. The declarations, with their values, are as given by Laurent. If the declarer has declared a *poignée* and fails to fulfil his contract, he pays to each opponent the value of the *poignée*. The rule governing the *Petit* in the last trick is obscurely stated; it may be meant to agree with Arnett or with *AT*. The scoring system and the scores for *chelem* agree with those given by Laurent. However, the scoring system appears to be differently interpreted: the base value is not paid by or to each opponent; the opponents pay or are paid only the excess or deficit, subject to the multiplier. The base value is, instead, stated to be a 'prize' won by a successful declarer, it is unclear from what source; nothing is said about a corresponding penalty for an unsuccessful one. This, if intended, is probably a mistake. In any case, the *chelem* payments are made by or to each opponent. The payment of 10 game points for the *Petit* in the last trick is unaffected by the multiplier. *Mouches* are left unmentioned.

Although the four-handed game has replaced the three-handed one as the dominant form, there are still both three- and five-handed versions of the contemporary game. The F.F.T. rules relate only to the four-handed form, and McLeod's observations were also of the four-handed version; otherwise all the above mentioned sources describe forms for three and for five players.

Contemporary three-handed French Tarot

All is as in the preceding four-handed game, save for the exceptions to be stated. Almost certainly all the variants and variations given for the four-handed game are found here too, but those dervived from the F.F.T. rules and from McLeod are unconfirmed.

The dealer gives twenty-four cards to each player, constituting a *chien* of six cards in the process. For Arnett, Laurent and Simpkins the deal is in eight rounds of three cards each, with the *chien* constituted as before; for *AT*, it is in six rounds of four cards each, with one card dealt to the *chien* at the end of each round of dealing.

The bidding is exactly as before, with the variations stated, save that Laurent admits a bid of *petit chelem* in this game as well as one of *grand chelem*; for him *petit chelem* is a contract to take all the tricks but two. Note that, both for *AT* and for Simpkins, an announcement of *petit chelem*, like one of *grand chelem*, is subject to the same conditions and has the same significance as in the four-handed game.

For Laurent and Arnett, a simple *poignée* requires 13 trumps, a double one 15 trumps and a triple one 18 trumps. For Simpkins, declarations of '13 trumps', '15 trumps' and '22 trumps' replace those of '10 trumps', '13 trumps' and '18 trumps' respectively. For *AT*, there are declarations of '13 trumps', '15 trumps', '18 trumps' and '21 trumps', replacing those of 10, 13, 15 and 18 respectively. In all other respects, the rules governing declarations given by the four sources remain exactly as before. This yields the following table, the Fournier leaflet again agreeing with Laurent.

	AT	*Laurent*	*Arnett*	*Simpkins*
13 trumps	10	20	10	10
15 trumps	20	30	20	20
18 trumps	30	40	30	–
21 trumps	40	–	–	–
22 trumps	–	–	–	40
no trumps	10	10	10	10
no counting cards	–	10	10	10
no court cards	10	–	–	–

The play and scoring are as before, with the variations there noted, save that in this game Laurent fixes the value of a *grand chelem* bid at only 250 game points, and that of a *petit chelem* at 100 game points; it is not clear whether he allows a special score for an unannounced *chelem*, as he does in the four-handed game, where it was worth half the value of one that was bid. These low values for *chelem* accord very badly with a scoring system, such as Laurent's, in which there is a multiplier according to the contract; since one who makes all the tricks will have 55 points (91 – 36) in overshoot points, he will gain 320 game points from each opponent if he bid *garde* on the ordinary system of scoring, so that it will pay him not to bid *grand chelem*. Some adjustment is therefore necessary. Arnett maintains his value of 1000 game points for an announced *grand chelem*, and Simpkins his scores of 800 and 1600 for announced *petit* and *grand chelem*. For Arnett, the score for overshoot points or for deficit is reckoned in whole numbers; for Laurent, it usually is, but is often rounded to the nearest multiple of 5; for Simpkins, it is rounded to the nearest multiple of 10. In the first case ½ point, in the second 2½ points and in the third 5 points should be rounded to the disadvantage of the declarer.

Laurent, Arnett and Simpkins describe a five-handed form in which the declarer calls a King, as in the five-handed game set out above.

Contemporary five-handed French Tarot with calling

Deal and play are counter-clockwise according to Laurent and Arnett, clockwise according to Simpkins. The dealer gives fifteen cards to each player in five rounds of three each, starting with the player next in rotation to himself. In the course of the deal, he constitutes a *chien* of three cards only, at his discretion, one at a time according to Laurent, all at once according to Simpkins, and not using the first three or the last three cards according to Laurent and Arnett. According to Arnett, the deal is annulled if any player has the *Petit* but no other trump or the Excuse.

The bidding proceeds as in the four-handed game, with possible positive bids of *prise* or *petite*, *pousse*, *garde*, *garde sans le chien* and *garde contre le chien*. Laurent allows a bid of *grand chelem*, in which the declarer takes the *chien*. Arnett does not admit a *chelem* bid, but allows the declarer to announce *grand chelem* having made his discard, if any. Simpkins also admits no *chelem* bids, but allows the declarer (not his partner) to announce *petit chelem* or *grand chelem* before the tenth trick. To succeed in *petit chelem*, it is necessary to win all the tricks but one, or all but two if the declarer has the Excuse.

Except in a *garde sans le chien* or *garde contre le chien*, the declarer takes the *chien* and discards three cards. He may not discard a King or a *bout*, nor, according to Arnett, a trump. Having made his discard, the declarer calls a King he does not have, or, if he has all four Kings, a Queen. The holder of the called card becomes his partner, but does not announce the fact. Note that the permission accorded by Laurent to an opponent to double a bid (or to a second opponent to redouble it) in the course of the bidding must be withdrawn in this game, although he does not say so, since a player will not in general know whether he will be the declarer's partner or not. If doubling is allowed at all, it must take place after the declarer has called a card, but Laurent says nothing about this. None of the sources states what happens, in a *garde sans le chien* or *garde contre le chien*, if the called card is found to be in the *chien*. Presumably the declarer is then deemed to have played alone, but it would be logical if the *chien* were to be his even though he had bid *garde contre le chien*.

Possible declarations are: *poignée* (eight trumps); double *poignée* (ten trumps); triple *poignée* (fifteen trumps according to Laurent and Simpkins, thirteen according to Arnett and the Fournier leaflet); *pas d'atout* (no trumps); and *pas d'honneur* (no counting cards). According to Laurent, a player with the Excuse may declare 'no trumps'; according to Arnett and Simpkins, he may not. Trumps to the number required for a *poignée* declaration must be shown; the Excuse counts for this purpose as a trump, but may be shown only if the player has no other trumps. No declaration is obligatory. A declaration is made just before a player plays to the first trick according to Laurent and Arnett; according to Simpkins, there is a round of declarations before play begins.

The values of the declarations are as at the top of the left-hand column on the next page:

	Laurent	*Arnett*	*Simpkins*	*Fournier*
8 trumps	20	10	10	20
10 trumps	30	20	20	30
13 trumps	–	30	–	40
15 trumps	40	–	40	–
no trumps	10	10	10	10
no counting cards	10	10	10	10

According to Simpkins, each declaration is personal and independent of the outcome of the round, and the player making it is paid its value by each of the other four players. Laurent and Arnett recognise the same rule for *misère* declarations ('no trumps' and 'no counting cards'). For them, *poignée* declarations are paid at the end of the round. If such a declaration was made by an opponent, he is paid its value, irrespective of the outcome of the round, by each of the other four. If it was made by the declarer or his partner, its value is added to the amount that each opponent has to pay if the declarer's side won the round, or to the amount each opponent receives if the declarer's side lost.

According to Laurent, the player to the dealer's right always leads to the first trick; according to Arnett, this is so unless a *grand chelem* has been announced, in which case the declarer leads; according to Simpkins, the lead is made by the player who made the first positive bid. Simpkins prohibits the player who leads from leading the suit of the called card, unless he is the declarer. Play is in accordance with the *Basic rules of modern French Tarot* (see above).

If a player wins the last trick with the *Petit*, then, according to Laurent, each of the other four players pays him 10 game points multiplied by the multiplier corresponding to the contract (see below); if he loses the *Petit* in the last trick to any other player, he pays a corresponding penalty to each of the other four. According to Arnett, if the declarer or his partner wins the last trick with the *Petit*, each of the three opponents pays 10 game points, irrespective of the contract, which the two partners divide between them; there is no bonus or penalty if one of them captures his partner's *Petit* in the last trick. If the declarer or his partner loses the *Petit* to one of the opponents in the last trick, each pays 30 game points, which are divided between the three opponents. If an opponent plays the *Petit* to the last trick, there is no bonus or penalty. Simpkins does not mention the *Petit au bout* at all, but has in private correspondence acknowledged the omission as an error.

The value of the round has three components: the base value of the contract; the score for the difference between the point-total of the declarer's side and the required total, according to the number of *bouts* in their tricks (see *Basic rules*); and, as already stated, the value of any *poignée* declarations made by the declarer or his partner. (On Simpkins's system, this last component is missing.) The base values are as follows, the Fournier leaflet agreeing with Laurent:

	Laurent	*Arnett*	*Simpkins*
prise	25	10	10
pousse	50	20	20
garde	100	40	40
garde sans le chien	200	80	80
garde contre le chien	300	120	160

According to Arnett and Laurent, the difference score is first rounded to a whole number, or to a multiple of 5 (½ point or 2½ points being rounded to the disadvantage of the declarer's side), and then subjected to a multiplier, as follows:

prise – 1; *pousse* – 2; *garde* – 4; *garde sans le chien* – 8; *garde contre le chien* – 12.

Simpkins does not apply a multiplier: the difference is simply rounded to the nearest multiple of 10, 5 points being rounded to the disadvantage of the declarer's side. When the value of the round has been computed from these three components (two under Simpkins's system), each opponent pays the resultant sum if the declarer's side has won, and the declarer shares the proceeds with his partner; if the declarer's side has lost, the corresponding sum is received by each opponent, the declarer and his partner sharing equally in the payments. Thus, on the system of Laurent and Arnett, if the declarer and his partner lose, they pay for the *poignée* declarations they have made.

A *grand chelem*, when bid, is paid at a flat rate of 200 game points, whether won or lost, according to Laurent; point-totals are ignored. This would imply a payment of 100 game points for an unannounced *grand chelem*, if recognised (the point is left unclear). The same remarks as under the three-handed game apply even more strongly in this case: it would actually become advantageous for the declarer of a *pousse* unnecessarily to lose one trick; if it contained no counting cards, the score for the round would then be 154 game points, all the other tricks being won. Arnett allows 1000 game points, for win or loss, for an announced *grand chelem*; Simpkins values announced *petit chelem* at 800 game points and announced *grand chelem* at 1600 (with alternative values of 200 and 300).

If there are *mouches*, the declarer and his partner divide the largest *mouche* if they win, but the declarer alone doubles it if they lose.

Note

Though Simpkins devotes the bulk of his account to the five-handed game, the notices of it by Laurent and Arnett are very cursory, simply listing a few points of distinction from the four-handed one. It is therefore possible that they have overlooked some such points. In particular, individual payments for the *Petit au bout* and for *poignée* declarations seem an especially bad idea in this game. It would be preferable to treat both as contributing to the payments between the two sides. The value of every *poignée* declaration would then be paid by the losers to the winners, regardless of who had made it. The payment for the *Petit au bout* would be independent of who won the round: if the last trick was won by the *Petit*, payment for it would be added to or subtracted from the payment for the round according as the feat had been accomplished by one of the winners or one of the losers; likewise when the *Petit* was captured in the last trick, but only when it was captured from a member of the opposing side.

AT recognises only a five-handed version in which the declarer plays alone, as he does in the three- and four-handed games. This development is in line with the general direction of evolution of modern French Tarot: first the old Tarot d'Appel was replaced by a four-handed form in which the declarer played alone; then a five-handed version was introduced which employed the old idea of calling a card; now some players have eliminated that in favour of a form with five players in which the declarer plays alone.

Contemporary five-handed French Tarot with a solo declarer

Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The dealer gives fourteen cards to each player in five rounds, the first of two cards each and the remainder of three cards each, beginning with the player to his right; in the course of the deal, he constitutes a *chien* of eight cards by dealing two cards to it at the end of every round of the deal except the first. A player who has the *Petit* but no other trump nor the Excuse may, if he wishes, annul the deal, and there is a new deal by the next dealer.

The bidding is opened by the player to the dealer's right. Possible positive bids are, in ascending order: *prise* or *petite*; *pousse*; *garde sans le chien*; and *garde contre le chien*. There is no *chelem* bid. No player is obliged to make a positive bid; the bidding terminates as soon as each player has spoken once or when *garde contre le chien* has been bid; each player must either pass or make a bid higher than any yet made, not necessarily the minimum such bid. The declarer plays alone against the other four. In a *prise* or a *pousse*, he exposes the *chien* and then takes it into his hand and discards eight cards; he may not discard a King or a *bout*, and may discard trumps only if he is compelled to, in which case he must announce their number, but not their rank. In a *garde sans le chien*, the *chien* is set aside unseen but counts to the declarer at the end of the round; in a *garde contre le chien*, it is set aside unseen and counts at the end of the round to the opponents.

The player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. During the first trick, each player may, before playing his card, make a declaration if he wishes; he is never obliged to do so. The only declarations permitted are those of '8 trumps', '10 trumps' and '13 trumps'; *misère* declarations are not allowed in this game. A player making a declaration must show trumps to the number he has declared; the Excuse counts for this purpose as a trump, but may be shown only if the player has no trumps he is not showing. It is permitted to make a lower declaration than one is able to. The declarer (successful bidder) may, before he plays to the first trick, announce either *petit chelem* or *grand chelem*. *Grand chelem* is a contract to win all the tricks, the Excuse having its special power of winning the last trick (see *Basic rules*); *petit chelem* is a contract to win every trick but one, the Excuse not having its special power. Play is in all cases in accordance with the *Basic rules*.

If the declarer wins, each of the four opponents pays him as many game points as he has points in excess of the required total. In addition, each pays him a base value of 10 game points in a *pousse*, 50 game points in a *garde sans le chien* and 100 game points in a *garde contre le chien*. There is no multiplier in the higher contracts, and no base value in a *prise*; if the declarer of a *prise* makes the required total exactly, he receives nothing from the opponents. If the declarer loses, he pays to each opponent as many game points as his point-total falls short of the required total, together with the base value in a contract other than *prise*. Whether he wins or loses, an odd ½ point is rounded to the disadvantage of the declarer. If any player, whether the declarer or an opponent, made a declaration, its value is added to the payment the declarer receives from each opponent if he won, or to that which he makes to each opponent if he lost; who pays and who receives the value of a declaration therefore does not depend upon who made it, but only on who won the round. The values of the declarations are: 8 trumps – 10 game points; 10 trumps – 20 game points; 13 trumps – 30 game points. If the declarer made a *chelem* announcement, his point-total and his previous bid are disregarded: he receives 150 game points for *petit chelem*, and 250 for *grand chelem*, from each opponent if he is successful, and pays the same amount to each if he is unsuccessful; payments for declarations and for the *Petit au bout* still apply. If the declarer makes all the tricks without having announced *chelem*, payment is made on the ordinary basis; if the opponents had the Excuse, they must in this case surrender it, though in a *garde contre le chien* they retain the *chien*. Similarly, if the declarer makes no tricks, payment is on ordinary principles; he surrenders the Excuse if he had it, but retains the discard or *chien* (except in a *garde contre le chien*).

The *Petit au bout* is worth 10 game points; payment for it is independent of who won the round. Such payment is, however, still governed by the principle of the solidarity of the opponents. If the declarer won the last trick with the *Petit*, or captured it in the last trick, each opponent pays him 10 game points; if the declarer lost it in the last trick, or if an opponent won the last trick with it, the declarer pays each opponent 10 game points. If one opponent captures the *Petit* in the last trick from another opponent, there is neither penalty nor bonus.

At the start of the game, or whenever there is no *mouche*, the dealer contributes 20 game points and each of the other players contributes 10 game points to form the first *mouche*. When there is at least one *mouche* on the table at the start of a deal, the dealer adds 10 game points to the largest one. A successful declarer takes the largest *mouche*; an unsuccessful one pays to the table an amount equal to the largest *mouche* to form a new one.

Many French Tarot players do not shuffle the pack before a deal, but only cut it, in order to make the hands more interesting; this practice can hardly be regarded as having the status of a rule.

Modern French Tarot, in all its forms, and the Besançon/Dijon game from which it is derived, constitute the only variety of Tarot game in which win or loss of the round does not depend straightforwardly on the number of points made on the cards taken in tricks, except for games like Tarocchino and Minchiate in which points are gained for having special combinations of cards among those won in tricks. This is, of course, partly a matter of the form of computation adopted for historical reasons. If one were to assign 10 points instead of 5 to each *oudler* or *bout*, and to reckon an additional 5 points for having two or more *oudlers*, the total number of points would be 111 instead of 91, and one could say that in all cases the declarer won if he made at least 56 points; the effect would be just the same as under the existing rules. But, however calculated, the game is one in which the *oudlers* play a yet more important part in determining win or loss than in most Tarot games. This means that to capture or bring home the *Petit* assumes an especial importance. It is effectively worth at least 10 points; to a declarer who has one other *oudler*, the loss of the *Petit* is in effect a loss of 15 points, to one who starts with only one *oudler*, the capture of the *Petit* is worth 15 points.

A declarer who does not have the *Petit* must decide at the outset whether or not he is going to try to capture it. If he is, he should eschew a discard that leaves him void in any suit, because the opponents, if they discover it, will keep leading that suit to weaken his trump holding. If he is not attempting to capture the *Petit*, and has a good length in trumps, a void is, as in most Tarot games, an advantage, because of the probability that he will be able to trump the King and other court cards of that suit; it is also advisable for a declarer who has the *Petit* but only a short trump holding, because it affords him the best chance of saving the *Petit*. In the three-handed game, unless the declarer has a solid sequence of top trumps, his best plan, if he wishes to capture the *Petit*, is to begin by leading a medium high trump (the 13 or thereabouts), and continue by leading lower ones whenever he regains the lead, with the purpose of forcing out his opponents' high trumps, until he judges that the moment has arrived to lead his own high ones and so capture the *Petit*. In the four-handed game, a shorter sequence of top trumps may naturally serve for the capture of the *Petit*, but, in default of this, it is best to lead quite a low one at the outset. It is often possible to tell, from the opponent's response to these tactics, where the *Petit* lies, because the player who has it will want to get rid of his high trumps as quickly as possible, in the hope of being unable to play higher and so put his Petit on a later trick his partner, or one of them, will win; the partners will try to hold on to their high trumps as long as possible. An opponent who gets the lead and has the 21 is often well advised to lead it if he thinks that the *Petit*, held by one of his partners, is in danger. The declarer's best chance of capturing the *Petit* occurs when it is in the hand of the player to his right. If the declarer has the *Petit* himself, and is in danger of losing it, he can sometimes throw the opponents off the scent by playing so as to feign to be trying to capture it; if his ruse succeeds, they will avoid trump leads, and will seek a suit in which he is short so as to force his trumps; he can then play the *Petit* to a trick in that suit as soon as he is void. The opponents may likewise play so as to capture the *Petit* from the declarer; they will judge whether to do this in part by how many trumps they have seen in the *talon* or *chien*. An opponent who has the *Petit* will warn off his partners from a hunt for it by playing a high trump. It is important to adapt one's strategy to the changing situation; a hunt for the *Petit* prolonged after it has a real chance of success may spoil a good hand. If the opponents are not seeking to capture the *Petit* and are not worried about losing it, they will most likely concentrate on finding the suits in which the declarer is void or short; the player to his left is well placed to try out different suits for this purpose.

Tarot players in France are mostly unaware of the modes of play that exist in other countries, and therefore unlikely to be influenced by them. But the game is now in the most interesting possible state. It has attained great popularity, and constantly attracts new players. Most of those who play it are not conscious of any local custom or ancient tradition of play to be piously preserved. Treatises about it are coming out at a rapid rate; Patrick Arnett is a Bridge expert, and his book contains a method of evaluating a hand by points (not just the point-values of the cards) intended as comparable to those used by Bridge players, while *AT* is an analysis of strategy quite as detailed as any Bridge manual, which, moreover, does not have to spend time on the bidding conventions which make Bridge so wearisome for many beginners to learn. As is apparent from this chapter, there is still a great deal of variation in the rules, and it is probably premature for the F.F.T. to have attempted to impose uniformity in this respect. It is precisely when a game has been taken up with enthusiasm by a wide range of new players, and is the subject of painstaking analysis, that it undergoes a rapid evolution, as different players try out new ways of perfecting it; some ideas may be imported from other games, as the *petit chelem* in Tarot was evidently borrowed from Bridge, but most of the changes will be due to the needs of the game itself, as different players come to see them. French Tarot may be expected to have an eventful future.